FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-244
Thursday
21 December 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-244 CONTENTS *21 December 1989*

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Grinevskiy Comments on Vienna Talks *[TASS]* 1
Soviet Troop Numbers Abroad Cited for UN Session *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Dec]* 1
Accord With U.S. To Avert Armed Conflict Viewed *[TRUD 15 Dec]* 1

Worldwide Issues

20 Dec Perfilyev Press Briefing Reported 4
  'Deep Concern' Over Panama Situation *[Moscow Radio]* 4
  Effect on U.S.-USSR Ties *[TASS]* 4
  Shevardnadze's West Europe Trip *[TASS]* 4
  CSSR Prime Minister's Visit *[TASS]* 4
  CPSU Delegation To Visit PRC *[TASS]* 4
  Claim of Afghan 'Brainwashing' *[TASS]* 5

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Fitzwater Cited on Scowcroft PRC Trip *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 20 Dec]* 6
U.S. To Increase Spy Satellite Allocations *[TASS]* 6
Bush Rejection of Command Center Plan Reported *[PRAVDA 17 Dec]* 6
Federal News Service, TASS Sign Accord *[TASS]* 6

Northeast Asia

ROK Businessmen, Students Attend USSR Seminar *[Moscow International]* 7
North Hamgyong Delegation Visits Primorskiy Kray *[Moscow International]* 7

Sub-Saharan Africa

Scholar Views Changes in Policy Towards Africa *[Moscow International]* 8
CPSU Delegation Visits Benin, Holds Talks *[PRAVDA 17 Dec]* 9
Ethiopian Government, TPLF Hold Talks in Rome 9
  Commentary Views Talks *[Borisov on Moscow International]* 9
  Drought Relief Viewed *[Mikhaylov on Moscow International]* 10
  Government Showing Goodwill *[Yevgenyev on Moscow International]* 10
RSA Conference for Democratic Future Examined *[Fedorov on Moscow International]* 10
Kornilov Comments on South African Reforms *[Moscow International]* 11
Correspondent Views East Africa Refugee Problem *[Borisov on Moscow International]* 12
Zimbabwean ANU-PF Congress Holds Session 12
  CPSU Central Committee Greeting *[PRAVDA 18 Dec]* 12
  Malkov Leads CPSU Delegation *[PRAVDA 19 Dec]* 12

East Europe

Reportage on Romanian Unrest, Government Reaction 13
  Romanian Beam Reports Initial Unrest *[Moscow Radio]* 13
  Civilian Resistance Noted *[Moscow International]* 13
  Suppression of Demonstrations Noted *[PRAVDA 20 Dec]* 13
  E. Europe Protests Crackdown *[PRAVDA 21 Dec]* 14
  World Media Cited *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 20 Dec]* 14
  AGERPRESS Refuses Comment *[TASS]* 14

  - Romanian Silence Undermines Prestige *[IZVESTIYA 21 Dec]* 15
  - Ceausescu Blames Anti-National Elements *[TASS]* 15
  - Bucharest Crowd Broken Up *[TASS]* 15
  - Protest in Bucharest *[TASS]* 16
  - Zaykov: Events ‘Not Unexpected” *[Moscow International]* 16
- Ceausescu 18 Dec Arrival in Tehran Reported *[PRAVDA 19 Dec]* 16
  - Says Iran Talks ‘Good’ *[PRAVDA 21 Dec]* 16
- CSSR Premier Visits Moscow, Meets Leaders 17
  - Meets Ryzhkov *[PRAVDA 21 Dec]* 17
  - Soviet Troops Discussed *[Moscow TV]* 18
  - Meets Gorbachev *[PRAVDA 21 Dec]* 18
  - Seen Off by Shevardnadze *[IZVESTIYA 21 Dec]* 19
- Shevardnadze, CSSR Counterpart Discuss Ties *[TASS]* 19
- CPCZ’s Calfa Supports Havel for CSSR President *[PRAVDA 20 Dec]* 20
- CPCZ Central Committee Meets on Eve of Congress *[TASS]* 20
- Ladislav Adamec Elected CPCZ Chairman *[TASS]* 20
- CPSU Central Committee Greets CPCZ Congress *[PRAVDA 20 Dec]* 20
- Dubcek Views Past, Future of CPCZ *[MOSCOW NEWS No 50]* 21
- Prague Party Chief Cited on Crisis in CPCZ *[PRAVDA 20 Dec]* 23
- FRG’s Kohl Visits GDR, Meets Leaders 24
  - Meets Modrow in Dresden *[PRAVDA 20 Dec]* 24
  - Urges ‘Prudence’ on German Unity *[IZVESTIYA 21 Dec]* 24
- Soviet Army Helps Alleviate GDR Freight Delays *[PRAVDA 19 Dec]* 25
- Hungary’s Nemeth Receives FRG Leader Kohl *[IZVESTIYA 20 Dec]* 25
- Gorbachev Congratulates New MSZMP Chief *[PRAVDA 20 Dec]* 25
- New MSZMP Chief Discusses Party’s Tasks *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Dec]* 26
- Bulgarian National Assembly Session Reported *[IZVESTIYA 17 Dec]* 26
- Repression of Bulgarian ‘Informals’ Noted *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 14 Dec]* 27
- Anti-Soviet Feelings in Poland Viewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 19 Dec]* 28

West Europe

- Shevardnadze on Thatcher-Gorbachev Contacts *[Moscow TV]* 30
- Unification Issue Aired at German SPD Congress *[PRAVDA 19 Dec]* 30
- PRAVDA Reports on DKP Plenum Proceedings *[20 Dec]* 31
- French Defense Minister’s Speech Criticized *[Balebanov in SELSKAYA ZHIZN 12 Dec]* 31
- Minister Katushev Signs Finnish Trade Protocol *[Helsinki Radio]* 31
- Sweden Says Wallenberg Search ‘Must Continue’ *[MOSCOW NEWS 10 Dec]* 32

Latin America & Caribbean

- Government Statement on U.S.‘Attack’ on Panama *[TASS]* 32
  - UN Envoy at Security Council Debate *[TASS]* 33
- Further Reportage on U.S. ‘Invasion’ of Panama 33
  - U.S. Motives Examined *[Fesuninko on Moscow TV]* 33
  - Parliamentarian Urges ‘Proper Measures’ *[Moscow TV]* 34
  - U.S. Displays ‘Imperial Thinking’ *[Zafesov in PRAVDA 21 Dec]* 34
  - TASS Reports ‘Bounty’ on Noriega 35
  - TASS Describes Situation 35
  - Baker Holds Special Briefing *[TASS]* 36

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Congress of People’s Deputies

- Deputies Agree on Longer Sessions; To End 24 Dec *[TASS]* 37
- Further on 15 Dec Congressional Speeches 37
  - Turkmenistan’s Niyazov *[PRAVDA 18 Dec]* 37
  - Belov on Anti-Drink Campaigns *[PRAVDA 18 Dec]* 39
  - Gidaspov on Private Ownership *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Dec]* 41
- Deputy Criticizes Idea of Regional Autonomy 16 Dec *[PRAVDA 18 Dec]* 41

- Deputies Comment on Discipline Problems *[Buzhkevich in PRAVDA 17 Dec]* 44
- 18 Dec Congressional Speeches Reported 45
  - Nishanov Report *[PRAVDA 19 Dec]* 45
  - Slyunkov Address *[PRAVDA 20 Dec]* 49
- Premier Ryzhkov Addresses Congress 19 Dec *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 20 Dec]* 50
  - Stands by Program *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 19 Dec]* 51
- Moscow TV Carries 20 Dec Congressional Session 52
  - 1300 GMT 52
  - 1337 GMT 52
  - 1511 GMT 53
  - 1631 GMT 54
  - 1726 GMT 54
  - 1828 GMT 55
- Further on 20 Dec Congressional Proceedings 55
  - Death of Deputy Mazurov *[Moscow Radio]* 55
  - Draft Regulations *[TASS]* 56
  - Amended Economic Plan *[TASS]* 56
  - Languages, Voting Debated *[TASS]* 57
  - Electoral System Amendments *[TASS]* 57
- 20 Dec Congressional Speeches Reported 57
  - Slyunkov Address *[Moscow TV]* 57
  - Ovchinnikov Report *[Moscow TV]* 59
  - Shcherbakov Remarks *[PRAVDA 20 Dec]* 59
- TASS Reviews 20 Dec Congressional Session 60
- Yeltsin on Issues Facing Second Congress *[MOSCOW NEWS No 50]* 61
- Four Deputies View Personal Achievements *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 50]* 61

Political and Social

- Lithuanian Communist Party Declares Independence *[TASS]* 62
  - Congress Debate Reported *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Dec]* 62
  - Moscow TV on Debate 63
  - 'Alternative Conference' Planned *[TASS]* 64
- Vilnius Radio Carries 20 Dec CP Congress 64
  - 0710 GMT 64
  - 0902 GMT 65
  - 1015 GMT 66
  - 1120 GMT 67
  - 1140 GMT 67
  - 1720 GMT 68
- Lithuanian Party Congress 21 Dec Morning Session *[Vilnius Radio]* 68
  - 0848 GMT 69
  - 1012 GMT 69
- Latvian Court Rules on Local Elections *[MOSCOW NEWS No 50]* 70
- Latvian KGB Confiscates 'Arsenal' *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 Dec]* 72
- Results of Estonian 10 Dec Local Elections *[Moscow Radio]* 73
- Estonian Deputies Comment on Draft Press Law *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 26 Nov]* 73
- Gidaspov Comments on Leningrad Political Situation *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Dec]* 75
- Leningrad Joint Plenum Issues Resolution *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 29 Nov]* 76
- Leningrad Communist Party Platform Published *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 29 Nov]* 77
  - Workers Support Platform *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 29 Nov]* 84
- Popov Ideas on Economic Reform Criticized *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 Dec]* 85
- Journals Protest Efforts To Remove Editors *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 50]* 88
- Role of Constitutional Oversight Body Viewed *[PRAVDA 8 Dec]* 88
- Sociological Center Head on CPSU Role *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 13 Dec]* 91
- RSFSR Writers View Anti-Russian Sentiment *[NEDELYA No 47]* 95
- Fire in Caspian Oil Field Extinguished *[Baku Radio]* 99
- Cross-Examination Begins in Uzbek Bribery Trial *[PRAVDA 19 Dec]* 99
  - Legal Official on Trial *[Moscow TV]* 99
- Komi Obkom Plenum Discusses Nationalities *[Moscow Radio]* 101
- New Grodno Obkom Head Appointed *[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA 17 Nov]* 101

Officials Sign Priyezhev Obituary *[PRAVDA 19 Dec]* 102
Correction to Sakharov POLITYKA Interview *[Warsaw POLITYKA 25 Nov]* 102

Scientific

Central Press Beamed to Tashkent by Satellite *[Moscow Radio]* 102
Scientific 'Potential' Threatened by Emigration *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 14 Dec]* 102
'Timely, Reliable' Radiation Monitoring Urged *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 13 Dec]* 104
Arguments Against Nuclear Power Heard *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 Dec]* 106

Grinevskiy Comments on Vienna Talks

LD2012214989 Moscow TASS in English 1949 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Vienna December 20 TASS—By TASS correspondent Vladimir Smelov:

The outgoing year has seen rapid development in the all-European process.

The Soviet-American summit off Malta, which has become a major international event, and intensive and fruitful contacts among top leaders of European countries gave fresh impetus to the Vienna talks on confidence- and security-building measures in Europe. The fourth session of the talks ended today.

The characteristic feature of the session was an indepth analysis of the stances of the sides, which helps establish points of contacts in the approaches of the negotiating parties.

Opportunities for working out mutually-acceptable agreements open up at this stage.

As regards socialist countries, they kept abreast of the times and were persistently looking for ways to work out a comprehensive set of confidence-building measures at the earliest possible moment.

Warsaw Treaty countries specified the manner of notification and invitation to observers to watch air and naval activities and suggested a combinet method for the notification of military activity.

They expressed consent to set limits on the numerical strength of forces and on the number of tanks and armoured personnel carriers. Their actions were prompted by calls from neutral and non-aligned countries for curbs on offensive components of armed forces.

And yet the negotiations did not progress quickly, ambassador at large Oleg Grinevskiy, head of the Soviet delegation, told TASS.

He said that the negotiating parties have not yet been able to coordinate major aspects of a new set of mutually supplemented confidence-building measures that would apply to the airforce and navy. NATO representatives often say that these "awkward" questions should be bypassed in order to ensure progress at the talks.

But this would be only a semblance of progress, Grinevskiy said. Such "progress" would be self-deception, which is only half the trouble.

The public expects the talks to result in the working out of a new set of confidence-building measures, the implementation of which will lower the risk of military confrontation, he said.

By sidetracking the talks from the solution of vital problems and declaring that we were making progress, we would risk misleading the public, Grinevskiy said.

The beginning of the fifth session of the negotiatons next year will be marked by a very important event: The opening of a seminar on miltary doctrines.

This measure should contribute to confidence- and security- building in Europe. Businesslike and indepth discussion about military doctrines among prominent representatives of the armed forces of CSCE countries will help clarify stands about basic questions of miltary policy.

Soviet Troop Numbers Abroad Cited for UN Session

PM2012172789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Dec 89 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Soviet Troops Abroad"]

[Text] New York, 19 Dec—The Soviet Union has officially submitted figures to the United Nations on its military presence abroad. A letter—distributed here as an official UN General Assembly document—from V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, to the UN secretary general reports that the number of Soviet Armed Forces personnel stationed outside Soviet borders stands at 627,500.

The letter notes that during the third UN General Assembly special session devoted to disarmament the Soviet Union put forward the proposal that the organization's member states submit to the UN secretary general figures on their military presence abroad and on any foreign military presence on their territories. We are confident, the document points out, that the submission of these figures will contribute to the assertion in the United Nations of high standards of openness in the military sphere and to the expansion of objective information on the military potentials available to the international community. We hope that this step will promote a constructive discussion of the questions of gradually reducing foreign military presences with a view to their complete elimination.

Accord With U.S. To Avert Armed Conflict Viewed

90WC0020A Moscow TRUD in Russian 15 Dec 89 p 3

[Report on interview with Major General A. Bolyatko, deputy directorate chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, by V. Badurkin, Moscow: "'Orion' Enters Communications"; date and occasion not specified]

[Text] **As already reported, successful tests of communications channels were held on 8 December as called for in an agreement between the USSR and the United States on averting dangerous military activity. Our correspondent met with Major General A. Bolyatko, the head of a Soviet working group and deputy chief of a directorate of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff.**

[Badurkin] Many people remember the popular film hit about how our sailors were able to repel an attack by missiles that were launched at the will of a "mad" computer from a U.S. submarine. Are we immune today against such an "accident?"

[Bolyatko] In some areas of the globe, our and U.S. Armed Forces are in close proximity to each other. But the technical perfection of defensive systems, and the widespread distribution of various automated systems of command and control of combat actions, however paradoxical this may be, increase the risk of unintentional military incidents. "Computer viruses" and malfunctions of electronic systems and combat equipment make a person dependent on the creation of his own hands and brain. We cannot forget that all of this is controlled by ordinary people....

[Badurkin] If I understood you correctly, you do not exclude the possibility of tragic incidents....

[Bolyatko] You see, to entirely exclude them now is practically very difficult. Therefore, we must at first learn to avert incidents with all acceptable means or at least to localize their possible consequences. In a word, so that a spark would not burst into a flame. It is these objectives that are pursued by the agreement between the governments of the USSR and the United States on averting dangerous military activity which goes into effect on 1 January 1990.

[Badurkin] Inasmuch as this document affects the interests not only of military people, could you describe its contents in more detail....

[Bolyatko] Not going into great detail, I will note that it works out the procedure for settling conflict situations by peaceful means and blocking armed clashes as a result of incidents that occur or as the result of an incorrect estimate of the intentions of one of the parties. Moreover, this applies to all spheres of contact—on the ground, in the air, and at sea. Most of all this concerns situations when units and subunits of the armed forces of the USSR and the United States are close to one another, and when military personnel and equipment, by virtue of emergency situations or as a consequence of unplanned actions could enter within the boundaries of the state territory of the other country. The agreement prohibits, without appropriate notification, the employment of lasers for ensuring combat readiness if this can cause damage to equipment and create interference in the networks of command and control of the armed forces of the other side, and it defines measures for averting dangerous military activity in previously agreed areas of special attention.

[Badurkin] Usually, all international agreements operate in large-scale categories: State, areas, armed forces, etc., and even not omitting the individual person, his health, and his fate....

[Bolyatko] You are right. The distinction of this agreement is precisely that it is permeated with concern not only for humanity as a whole, but also for specific people in specific situations.

[Badurkin] Explain, please, with an example....

[Bolyatko] Let us assume that a military vessel of one of the sides, as a result of some kind of malfunction or because of weather conditions, finds itself in the territorial waters of the other side (which, incidentally, cannot be excluded entirely). In such an event, the ship will be given an agreed-to signal to withdraw from the boundaries of the foreign territory, or assistance is given in proceeding to a specific location where the crew is provided quick communications with diplomatic representatives, suitable living conditions for a sojourn and safe-keeping, and, if needed, repair of equipment as well....

[Badurkin] Many of us in past years were of the opinion that it was very difficult to come to an agreement about something with the Americans, especially when military interests are involved....

[Bolyatko] Our agreement disproves this stereotypical thinking. Judge for yourselves. In March of 1988, the ministers of defense of the USSR and the United States, examining mutual claims of conflict situations at a meeting in Berne, arrived at the thought of creating a mechanism for settling incidents and gave appropriate instructions to their staffs. In October, I already met for the first time with the head of the American working group, Major General George Butler. In only 9 months a document was signed on 12 June of this year. Moreover, these were not service recommendations as was planned at the beginning, but an intergovernmental agreement.

[Badurkin] Everything so swiftly and smoothly...?

[Bolyatko] Of course not. The work that was accomplished, I will say without exaggeration, was colossal. We met with Butler almost every month, we argued, we came to an understanding, and we reached mutual compromises. For example, the Americans reacted oversensitively to our proposals to limit the activity of their troops in some way. We were for a broader interpretation of dangerous military activity. But this did not prevent us from coming to a reasonable compromise that was satisfactory to both sides.

[Badurkin] For the agreement to begin to work, it has to be fully supported technically, for example....

[Bolyatko] Indeed. The key link here is the swift establishment of radio communications between the specific participants in the conflict situation. This was in the film with which we started our discussion, when the sailors quickly contacted each other and thereby averted an incident. In real life, only the 16th international VHF channel existed for such contacts. Essentially, all communications ran through the capitals of our countries. Now there will be 10 such channels; moreover, at different wavelengths. They were tested on 6-8 December in the Mediterranean and Bering Seas.

[Badurkin] I had occasion not too long ago to observe how "contact was made" by our military vessel and a U.S. helicopter in the Mediterranean Sea. The recollection is not very pleasant....

[Bolyatko] This time everything went successfully. In the south, the patrol ship *Razitelnyy* established reliable communications with a U.S. "Orion" patrol aircraft and the missile frigate **Capodanno**, and the frigate, in turn, with our Il-38M. In the Bering Sea the program was broader: Communication was established between Long Range Aviation aircraft (Tu-95 and TC-135), fighters (Su-27 and F-15), and ground posts. Although, because of poor weather, the tests had to be switched to one day, they were successful. Now there is confidence that starting on 1 January the agreement, as you put it, "will begin to work."

[Badurkin] The last question. Suppose, despite all preventive measures, an incident nonetheless occurs.... What then?

[Bolyatko] First, the agreement will not let it develop. This is the main thing. But further, a joint commission of specialists will go to work, which will explain its causes and develop recommendations for their elimination. I will repeat once more that starting with the new year the agreement will stand in the way of an accidental incident spreading into an armed conflict. In this way, peace will be more durable.

20 Dec Perfilyev Press Briefing Reported

'Deep Concern' Over Panama Situation

LD2012140489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Replying to correspondents' questions about events in Panama, Vadim Perfilyev, first deputy chief of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Information Directorate Affairs said: The reports that U.S. troops invaded the territory of the sovereign state of Panama gave rise, no matter what the motivation behind this is, to a feeling of deep concern in the Soviet Union. These actions which violate the UN Charter and the universally accepted norms of relations among states are to be condemned by world community. The United States of America should cease forthwith its armed intervention in Panama.

Effect on U.S.-USSR Ties

LD2012164789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1550 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Excerpt] Moscow, 20 Dec (TASS)—[Passage omitted] A statement by a USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman, circulated this morning through TASS channels, was announced by Vadim Perfilyev, first deputy head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, at a briefing as the first official reaction on the Soviet side. Having noted the broad response to the statement in the international—including U.S.—mass media, he expressed confidence that the USSR assessment also has become known to official Washington. Moreover, he did not exclude the possibility of an assessment of the events in Panama from the USSR side at a higher level.

In response to a question on whether the events in Panama will have a negative influence on relations between the USSR and the United States, Vadim Perfilyev stated that the time has come "to accustom ourselves to the fact that any event at any point of the globe should not necessarily be perceived from the position of East-West confrontation, characteristic of the "Cold War." [quotation marks as received]

The situation in which there is no interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states, wherever it may happen, corresponds to the interests of the United States and the USSR, emphasized the Soviet diplomat. "We must proceed from the fact that the situation in which peoples and countries decide their future themselves corresponds to the interests of all states, no matter which political alliance they belong to," said Vadim Pefilyev. And today's statement by a USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman on Panama, he emphasized, should be studied from just these positions.

Shevardnadze's West Europe Trip

LD2012143489 Moscow TASS in English 1355 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 20 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told a briefing here today about the return of Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze from his trip to Belgium and Britain.

Perfilyev recalled that during his stay in Brussels the minister met leaders of Belgium, the European Communities and NATO, and that he met British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and the British foreign minister while in the United Kingdom.

The spokesman noted that "these were very interesting talks that helped clarify the Soviet stand on major European problems."

CSSR Prime Minister's Visit

LD2012143689 Moscow TASS in Engliksh 1318 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 20 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev will meet Czechoslovak Prime Minister Marian Calfa today, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vadim Perfilyev said at a brifing here today, announcing the beginning of Marian Calfa's working visit to the USSR.

Negotiations have already been held between Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov and Prime Minister Calfa in Moscow today, Perfiliyev said.

The foreign ministers of the two countries also had a meeting at the Soviet Foreign Ministry, the spokesman added.

CPSU Delegation To Visit PRC

LD2012144289 Moscow TASS in English 1335 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 20 TASS-–A Soviet Communist Party delegation will visit the People's Republic of China on December 23. It will be led by Communist Party Central Committee member Valentin Falin, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vadim Perfiliyev said at a briefing today.

An accord on the resumption of inter-party relations was reached during the Sino-Soviet summit last May.

A Communist Party of China delegation visited the USSR in September at the invitation of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee. The delegation was led by member of the Communist Party of China Central Committee Zhu Liang.

Claim of Afghan 'Brainwashing'

LD2012191389 Moscow TASS in English 1626 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 20 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told a press briefing here today that the recent publication in LE FIGARO-magazine alleging that 20,000 Afghan children are being brainwashed in the Soviet Union was "an attempt to mislead the world public".

The French magazine alleged that ideological pro-communist brainwashing was being performed prior to sending children back to Afghanistan in order to promote a communist regime there.

The Soviet spokesman told journalists about the actual state of affairs: At the request of the Afghan Government nearly 1,500 formerly homeless Afghan children, many of them orphans, are now taught at boarding schools in the Russian Federation, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Kirghizia, Tajikistan and Turkmenia.

Perfilyev stressed that many children were orphaned as a result of clashes with the armed opposition and the bombing of Afghan cities and villages.

Afghan children are taught in accordance with a programme worked out by the Afghan side. Afghan history, literature and geography as well as Islam are taught to children by Afghan citizens, the Soviet spokesman pointed out.

United States & Canada

Fitzwater Cited on Scowcroft PRC Trip

PM2012120589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Trip Shrouded in Secrecy"]

[Text] Presidential National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft and U.S. Deputy Secretary of State Laurence Eagleburger made a secret trip to Beijing last July, White House Press Secretary Marlin Fitzwater admitted Monday. President G. Bush sent his agents to Beijing "to stress in person U.S. concern" at the events on Tiananmen Square, the White House statement said.

This admission was made only after CNN-TV reported on the secret trip to China by high-ranking administration representatives. According to THE WASHINGTON POST, they flew out by military plane under cover of darkness and returned to Washington after a brief stay in Beijing.

Fitzwater refused to give the precise date that Scowcroft and Eagleburger first visited China. However, judging by U.S. officials' statements, this was a few days after the White House—under strong pressure from the Congress—announced President Bush's decision 20 June "to temporarily postpone all high-level exchanges with PRC Government officials."

U.S. To Increase Spy Satellite Allocations

LD2012100389 Moscow TASS in English 1630 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] New York December 19 TASS—President George Bush has signed a secret supplement to the budget to increase allocations to intelligence services, the ABC television company reported, referring to well-informed sources.

The money is intended to design a new expensive intelligence satellite network "to more closely watch Soviet armaments and armed forces".

The United States, experts believe, hopes to double the number of its spy satellites by the mid 1990s. The funds allocated for the purpose are kept secret. They are "hidden" in various articles of the Pentagon budget, the report says.

According to President of the Federation of American Scientists John Pike, each of the new satellites will cost about a billion U.S. dollars and to maintain them will add from ten to fifteen billion dollars to the intelligence service budget over the next decade.

The president's decision, the television company stressed, was preceded by two-year-long debates in the U.S. Administration and the Congress on the expediency of building up space intelligence potential. The opponents of the project strongly objected, saying that an additional satellite system costing many billions of dollars, is not needed now tha the Soviet military threat is lessening, ABC diplomatic correspondent John Scali said.

But President Bush, he said, sided with the CIA and the Senate Special Committee on Intelligence which insist that new intelligence satellites are needed to verify the Soviet Union compliance with the arms control accords. Espionage remains a major concern of the U.S. Government, despite an improvement in East-West relations, the television company said.

Bush Rejection of Command Center Plan Reported

PM2012141589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Dec 89 Second Edition p 8

[TASS report: "Proposal Rejected"]

[Text] New York, 16 Dec—U.S. President Bush has rejected the Pentagon's proposal to renounce the 24-hour air alert duty of a command point which could be used for nuclear warfare. It has become known to THE NEW YORK TIMES that the military department intended to submit for the White House's examination a recommendation on ending this alert duty in its budget request for 1991. This proposal had already been approved by U.S. Defense Secretary Cheney.

According to the Pentagon plans, if the entire U.S. political leadership dies as the result of a surprise nuclear strike, the command of all U.S. nuclear forces should be assumed by one of the generals of the Strategic Air Command. With a view to such a crisis situation, since 1961 there have been 24-hour flights by Strategic Air Command aircraft taking turns performing the functions of an airborne command point. Now the leadership of the U.S. Defense Department has decided that there is no longer any need for continuous alert duty and has suggested for budget-saving purposes, which in fiscal 1991 alone could total nearly $20 million, that the entire fleet of Strategic Air Command aircraft be grounded for a while. The advancing of this initiative, THE NEW YORK TIMES points out, was a result of the certainty of the U.S. military that the danger of a surprise nuclear attack on the United States has been reduced.

Federal News Service, TASS Sign Accord

LD1912000189 Moscow TASS in English 0850 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Washington December 19 TASS—By TASS correspondent Andrey Fedyashin:

The United States Federal News Service announced on Monday that a cooperation agreement has been signed with the Soviet news agency—TASS.

In accordance with a FNS-TASS agreement, the Federal News Service will start from January 1, 1990 to disseminate the English texts of statements by Soviet leaders, records of press conferences and briefings held in Moscow by different Soviet ministries and departments.

The FNS is a unique information service which supplies its clients with transcripts of all important press conferences and briefings held in the White House, the Department of State and other U.S. establishments. It promptly transmits the texts of speeches delivered by U.S. statesmen, political and public leaders, records of their TV and radio interviews, records of Congress hearings, etc.

FNS subscribers include practically all the foreign embassies in Washington, state institutions, newspapers, radio and television companies. The FNS has recently started transmitting information abroad too.

A statement released here by the Federal News Service Corporation says that FNS subscribers will for the first time be able to receive prompt English translations of the transcripts of press conferences given by Kremlin officials and of their statements on all important international problems. In addition, FNS subscribers will be able to get the English texts of the most important political statements made by Gorbachev and Shevardnadze. The new FNS service is called the "Kremlin package".

"Our telephones have been ringing practically all day long after we made this announcement," Kurt Randell, president of the FNS Corporation, told TASS. He said that the corporation has already received numerous applications for its new service. Most come from newspapers, radio and television corporations.

Randell said he was very pleased by the good business relations established with TASS. The advantage of the new service, he believes, is that FNS subscribers will now be able to quickly compare the stands of the two countries on key problems. The information will be transmitted from Moscow on the day the event occurs.

Northeast Asia

ROK Businessmen, Students Attend USSR Seminar

SK2112015089 Moscow International Service in Korean 1330 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Text] A seminar on science which was specifically organized for students at the graduate school of Kyongnam Univerity [in the ROK] was held from 5 to 15 December in Moscow and Novakunisinsk under the auspices of (Sonnaventzelu) a Soviet-Canadian, joint venture company. The seminar was also attended by functionaries of ROK companies who wish to have contacts with external trade organs of the Soviet Union in the near future.

The primary purpose of the science seminar was to introduce the situation in the Soviet Union, including the domestic political situation, the domestic economic situation, and other potential (?business partners) to working-level businessmen. The participants of the seminar listened to the (?lectures) by research institutes in the United States and Canada on the political aspect of the perestroyka policy. Walebi Sustikov, economist and deputy director of the Economics of the World Socialist System Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, explained the Soviet economic plan and answered the questions raised by the participants.

During the seminar on science, besides Moscow, ROK businessmen also visited Leningrad, Khabarovsk, and Blagoveschchensk. In Blagoveschchensk they visited the (?vocational) school in the external economic liaison and cooperation center of the Amur Oblast Soviet Executive Committee. A meeting was held at the school between businessmen of the two countries. This meeting was the first mutual contact by businessmen of these two sides.

Mr Cho Yong-so related his impression of the meeting as follows:

[Begin recording] My first impression was relatively good. I saw many (?documents) that I could not see in our country. The city is very orderly, and the traffic in the city was also relatively orderly. We attended the current economic seminar [as heard] as did graduate school students. At the seminar we listened to a lecture on the Soviet Union's perestroyka policy. The lecture was relatively conducive to understanding perestroyka. I think that the seminar was an excellent one. We were also briefed by the research institute on the Soviet Union's perestroyka policy and other economic policies. This was definitely an opportunity that enabled us to know, to some extent, about the Soviet's perestroyka policy. [end recording]

We have introduced the first seminar on sciences which ROK business company presidents have attended thus far. The seminar was held in Moscow (?last 11 December). The seminar was the second one which was organized for college and university students. This type of seminar will become a traditional one because the ROK businessmen's interest in maintaining contacts with the Soviet Union is becoming greater.

North Hamgyong Delegation Visits Primorskiy Kray

SK2012232689 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 14 Dec 89

[From "Program to Highlight Primorskiy Kray"]

[Excerpts] Sometime ago, the North Hamgyong Provincial party delegation of the People's Korea visited the Primorskiy Kray. This visit, which was made under the agreement on political, economic, cultural, and sports relations between the border regions of the two countries, concluded the delegation exchange plan for 1989.

Comrade Choe Kyu-song, head of the delegation; Vladimir Zorin, secretary of the Primorskiy party committee; and Nikolay Taran, vice chairman of the Executive Committee of the Kray, made a deep and objective analysis of the economic relations between the Primorskiy Kray and North Hamgyong Province.

Comrade Choe Kyu-song, an agricultural expert, paid special attention to the agricultural and livestock sectors of the Primorskiy Kray.

Vice Chairman Nikolay Taran said that 137,000 workers are working in the general agricultual and industrial zone of our Kray; of these some 80,000 persons are engaged in agricultural production and others in the processing sector, construction sites, maintenance plants, and enterprises. We are producing grain, vegetables, milk, and fruits. We are also engaged in livestock, hunting, and bee farming. Our agricultural production totals 1.6 billion rubles. Frankly speaking, we have many problems. We must increase the production of farm produce and organize a good system of harvesting, storing, and processing vegetables and fruits. In order to solve these problems, we are introducing new labor organizational forms, such as the lease system, independent economic accounting system, and work team contract system. In order to encourage increased production, we are changing the pricing system.

We are also giving considerable attention to the social and welfare development of the rural area, and are building more houses, hospitals, kindergartens, and sports facilities.

The people of the Primorskiy Kray have long been aware that Korean farmers are good farmers. The Korean farmers who moved to the Primorskiy Kray in the 1860's reaped good crops of rice, vegetables, and beans, and extensively shared their knowledge with the Russian people. When the farmers of People's Korea work in our Kray, our farmers pay great attention to the methods which the Korean people employ in raising various kinds of produce.

Taran, vice chairman of the Executive Committee of the Kray, said: We are paying special attention to the development of the economic relations between the Primorskiy Kray and North Hamgyong Province. Our cooperation is helping to solve the urgent problem of food production. The farmers of People's Korea have been working in our Kray since 1987, and have engaged in farming vegetables, beans, and peas on three sovkhozes, namely, Arichomovskiy, Korsakovskiy, and Yuvgenyevskiy, this year. They have farmed on more than 1,000 hectares, and produced over 10,000 tonnes of vegetables, among other things, from this land. We intend to expand these relations next year to increase the vegetable production up to 40,000 tonnes by inviting the Korean farmers to 10 sovkhozes. [passage omitted]

Cooperation in the field of agriculture is only one of the problems to being discussed during the visit to Primorskiy Kray by the North Hamgyong Provincial party delegation. Relations between the two border regions cover many areas. A series of interesting contracts have been signed between the fishing and construction sectors of the two countries. A treaty on cultural cooperation, a subject about which we have talked a number of times on this program, has been signed as well. We can say that the joint work during 1989 has been fruitful.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Scholar Views Changes in Policy Towards Africa

LD1512225389 Moscow in English to Africa 1700 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Interview with Yevgeniy Tarabrin, "One of the leading Soviet scholars on Africa" to an unidentified correspondent, place, date not given; Tarabrin speaks in Russian with superimposed English translation—recorded; correspondent's questions are read by announcer]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] The restructuring in the Soviet Union and the concrete steps of the Soviet Government to translate into life the new political mentality have necessitated reassessment of the Soviet foreign policies, including the policies toward Africa. What had been changing in that respect? This is the topic of our correspondent's talks with Yevgeniy Tarabrin, doctor of history and one of the leading Soviet scholars on Africa. So here is Professor Tarabrin.

[Tarabrin] [Passage omitted] Solidarity remains intact in our relations with Africa. We will not abandon our friends and the national liberation movements that we have been backing, as it is sometimes labelled. So we stick to solidarity. But the question is how to manifest that solidarity. I believe that should be done by seeking mutually acceptable decisions instead of imposing views on each other. [passage omitted]

[Announcer] And what about Soviet aid to Africa? When the Supreme Soviet was debating the budget for next year some of the MPs suggested it should be curtailed, given our current economic difficulties.

[Tarabrin] The new budget envisages no cuts in aid to Africa, says Yevgeniy Tarabrin. It is of importance what shape the aid takes, to what degree it is effective. We have had many shortcomings in that respect. On the whole all of them are typical of our economy and were projected to our aid to foreign states. Those were the broken (?tombs) of construction and allocations for prestigious schemes. The scale of military aid was too great as well, sometimes that was unnecessary.

[Announcer] There were also political miscalculations in our links with Africa.

[Tarabrin] This is also typical of (?it). Africa's liberation coincided with the times of Khrushchev, who (?aspired to) communism by the 1980's. Those who translated our polices onto the African soil cherished the same illusions. The slogan was: "Do as I do". Advice given in those days took into account very little or else not at all specific local conditions of African countries. As a result our recommendations had no appropriate effect. The slogan "Those who are not with us are against us" was also present in our policies towards Africa. We claimed that the countries having close ties with the West were betraying the cause of progress, liberation, the OAU charter and so on. That approach was not actually facilitating African unity. The West, incidentally, acted the same. The United States maintained that African states should abide by the American values exclusively. The former metropolies imposed on their former colonies their own viewpoints.

[Announcer] But now the Soviet approach to relations with the African countries is changing, in what way?

[Tarabrin] Our new approach is based on the new political mentality. The major concept of this mentality can be applied in Africa too. That does not mean that we should be oblivious of national and class interests, but we maintain that in today's turbulent times, when the threat of war yet exists, the issue of unqiue human values and human kind's survival get special priority importance. This is the first maxim of our new approach. The second is the freedom of choice, that is each nation is entitled to choose the system of rule that it considers acceptable. Each nation should resolve its problems by means it sees necessary, and there should be no outright pressure or interference. Still another maxim is that all the regional conflicts should be resolved peacefully by political means. Incidentally, the years after the Second World War has evidenced some 140 regional conflicts. In some of the conflicts fighting has been continual since 1948 and 1949, but no regional conflicts have ever had any winners. The power of arms has brought victory to no one and under present day conditions there can be no other result. Another new element is the balance of interests, which is of great importance. One must not claim priority of his interests because they are just (?rightful). Compromises are impossible if international practices do not take account of balanced interests. So there should be tolerance, restraint and understanding of a differing stance. This concerns both assessments and actions. This serves the basis of our new approach to African countries. We have the belief that complicated African problems should be solved internationally. Neither the USSR nor the United States, France, or Britain can claim the right to resolve them solely. There exists a need for international consensus to entangle pressing issues by [word indistinct] and concerted effort. The deteriorating economic situation in Africa is a global issue and it involves everybody's interests and causes concern to everybody. This is what I think is characteristic of our new approach to African countries, said in conclusion Yevgeniy Tarabrin.

CPSU Delegation Visits Benin, Holds Talks

PM2012135389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Dec 89 Second Edition p 8

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] Cotonou, 16 Dec—Mama Sanni Gomina, member of the People's Revolutionary Party of Benin [PRPB] Central Committee Politburo and permanent secretary of the PRPB Central Committee, has received a CPSU delegation headed by Ye.M. Zolotarev, first secretary of the Aktyubinsk Kazakhstan Communist Party Oblast Committee, which is in the People's Republic of Benin.

During the talk Mama Sanni Gomina stated that Benin is following attentively the process of perestroyka in the Soviet Union and wished the Land of the Soviets further successes on the path of renewal and the expansion of democracy and glasnost.

Ethiopian Government, TPLF Hold Talks in Rome

Commentary Views Talks

EA1612184789 Moscow International Service in Swahili 1730 GMT 13 Dec 89

[Text] For the 2d day in Rome, the Italian capital, another session of preliminary contacts is being held between an Ethiopian Government delegation and leaders of the Tigray People's Liberation Front [TPLF]. The following is a commentary by Vladimir Borisov.

The second round of talks in Rome is expected to implement issues which were not fulfilled at the beginning of November—that is, to agree on the agenda for the talks on a cease-fire in the military conflict which has been going on for the past 14 years.

During recent months, the war has intensified. Rebels in northern Tigray Region launched a major offensive last August. They managed to take Gonder, Welo, and Shewa. The rebels advanced to a point 150 km from Addis Ababa. It is evident that these military successes of the TPLF have boosted the morale of the people of Tigray, despite the looming threat of a major famine, which has been exacerbated by the war.

According to estimates by UN Experts, famine is threatening 4-5 million people, as a result of food shortages. Before the two meetings, the TPLF announced that it would take a firm stand in talks with a government delegation. Earlier, the TPLF had demanded the authority to run its own affirs. [passage indistinct] when viewed from both sides, the government is bound to take a similar stand.

In Addis Ababa, there has been a major campaign to recruit civilians into the army. At present, youths who should be studying at school are being armed.

While preparing to launch a major attack, the Ethiopian Government is suspected by neighboring countries of striving to seek new friends from the outside, if such countries can provide military assistance. Only recently Ethiopia resumed diplomatic relations and military cooperation with Israel. This would have been thought impossible in the recent past. [passage indistinct]

Yesterday, during the 1st day of the talks, Ethiopian Government militia drove TPLF fighters out of Ibnet, in

Gonder Region. This military involvement is not conducive to meaningful talks. On the eve of the Rome talks, a firm stand has been taken, and there has been no desire to resolve the crisis peacefully. The famine crisis is being manipulated for political ends.

However, recent events give hope for an agreement. In Nairobi, agreement was reached on the agenda between the government and Eritrean rebels.

There is political cooperation between the TPLF and the Eritrean opposition leader. And recently, a party member had contacts with the Ethiopian Government. [passage indistinct]

The government criticized the Eritrean rebel organization for delays in holding the peace talks, expected to start at the beginning of next year. [passage indistinct]. It would be meaningless to allow the war to continue. Continuation of the war would create more misery and the deaths of thousands of people. This should be realized by those in Rome who are beginning the complex talks.

Drought Relief Viewed

EA1812064889 Moscow International Service in Amharic 1530 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Aleksandr Mikhaylov commentary]

[Text] Although the situation in the northern part of Ethiopia is similar to that in Sudan, it is hoped that the position taken by the Ethiopian Government will be constructive. The Sudan Administration has stopped the flight of aircraft to deliver food aid to the south. But it was disclosed in Rome on Tuesday that Addis Ababa was ready to open (?corridors) for delivering food aid in the northern regions. (?Corridors) for delivering food aid are to be reopened since it is believed that international donor organizations could provide the food supplies required by Tigray and Eritrean drought victims.

The reality of the statement will be confirmed if it is implemented in future. The representatives of the Ethiopian government and the Tigray People's Liberation Front [TPLF] are meeting in the Italian capital, and wish to work out the basis for future talks, and finalise the procedures.

It is true that the central government announced the opening of the (?corridors) to find a lasting solution to the problem in Tigray, and to show its goodwill over relief aid distribution. Whatever the case may be, it could be said that it is a very encouraging decision. On the other hand, the program for training volunteers will be continued, and the purpose is to completely crush the Tigray rebels. Since the Rome talks are being conducted behind closed doors, it can only be said that we hope it will achieve good results.

Government Showing Goodwill

EA1912162289 Moscow International Service in Amharic 1530 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Maksim Yevgenyev commentary]

[Text] The preparation of the agenda for the main peace talks to end the armed conflict in Tigray administrative region occupied the central place in the Rome meeting. It will be recalled that the conflicting parties could not reach agreement in the first meeting they held in the Italian capital last month. So, what was the result of the present negotiations?

The continuation of efforts to resolve politically the difficult situation in the northern part of Ethiopia should be supported, especially when we consider the prevailing situation in Ethiopia. The intense offensive launched last August by the Tigray People's Liberation Front [TPLF] intensified the bloodshed once again. The danger of drought which is added to the armed conflict has exacerbated the situation. The main cause of the problem is not only bad weather but also continuous war.

The war has prevented the peasants from gathering their harvest. In addition, it has created an obstacle for the distribution of food. So the Rome meeting opened in an alarming situation. It was disclosed on the eve of the meeting that the TPLF wanted to conduct it from a position of strength. Given all this, we were able to predict that the meeting would be a difficult one.

Following the usual procedure, the preliminary meeting was held in camera. They had to discuss the 10 items, which were estimated to be on the agenda. The negotiators did their best to make the atmosphere convenient for the main peace talks aimed at ending the war in Tigray. The talks have now been concluded. According to a report received from Rome, the Italian and Kenyan Governments have been selected to mediate in the main negotiations between the Ethiopian Government and the TPLF. Italy has accepted the invitation.

To state in short about the talks, it has given new impetus to the efforts to peacefully resolve the conflict in the northern part of the country. On the other hand, several issues still have to be resolved, to reach a mutually acceptable agreement which takes the interests of both parties into consideration. To resolve the antagonism, the two parties have to show goodwill.

The Ethiopian Government's expressed readiness to open corridors for food aid to drought hit areas is the manifestation of the government's goodwill.

RSA Conference for Democratic Future Examined

MB1612083589 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Aleksandr Fedorov commentary—read by announcer]

[Text] The Conference for a Democratic Future held in Johannesburg is one of the biggest events of the kind since the 50's: 4,500 delegates representing 2,100 organizations have called upon (?State) President Frederik de Klerk [words indistinct] (?attitude) to them. The South African media carried numerous commentaries but most of them amounted to summing up the number of African democratic organizations that ignored the conference. It is easy to give the message of the comments.

[Words indistinct] country's second biggest labor organization, the National Council of Trade Unions to participate announced by its official spokesman [name indistinct] [words indistinct] of the continuation of the struggle for leadership.

There is some truth to such conclusions. The African movement has never been homogeneous, and this is used by the authorities to keep up the system of separate development. For example, the Buthelezi movement continues a real war against democratic organizations and Africans.

[Words indistinct] the leaders of bantustans are accused of betraying the interests of the other tribes, though many of them protested against the experiments of the authorities in the racial sphere. We could also name those examples. Does this must mean that differences cannot be overcome?

Though the [words indistinct] of Frederik de Klerk are viewed in different ways, one can hardly claim that nothing has changed in the country, (?but) it is a different matter than what is going to follow: revolutionary changes (?planned) by the president or the abolition of petty apartheid.

If the president continues his rhetoric, the African National Congress warns, he is going to lose his authority at the very beginning of his presidency [words indistinct] of the democratic movement in the course of the election campaign [words indistinct] probably forced the government to take new steps toward greater democracy or at least not (?count) on the effectiveness of the traditional principle: divide and rule. The unanimity of the participants [words indistinct] international importance now that the world community insists on [word indistinct] changes in the political life of South Africa.

The National Council of Trade Unions has refused to participate in the conference [words indistinct] disagreed with the presence of the white Democratic Party [words indistinct] the party closely cooperates with the government, the labor organization said. This reminds me of the developments of 1984, when the [words indistinct] of the white movement (?raised in question) and the Conservative Party refused to cooperate with [name indistinct] because of their contacts with African liberation organizations [words indistinct] finally led to?

According to the South African historian Herman Gillomee, the conservatives became the [word indistinct] organization in South Africa [words indistinct] of an outsider and it is for South Africans to solve their own problems. It is evident, however, that old grudges and elements of power struggle can reduce the efforts of democratic African and white forces [words indistinct] forces that, despite the laws on subversive activities, had dialogues in Dakar and Western Europe, forces whose representatives have [word indistinct] the white man [words indistinct] give up their lives defending the interests of all races.

I do not think that the refusal of several African organizations to participate in the Conference for a Democratic Future can destroy the results of prior joint actions. (?There have been) many situations of the kind in a country where people are separated according to races [words indistinct] also wrong. However, we should not lose hope because the conference approved a declaration (?wishing) [words indistinct] to hold talks with the government on building a democratic South Africa if the necessary conditions are created for it.

Kornilov Comments on South African Reforms

MB1912101089 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Yuriy Kornilov commentary—read by announcer]

[Text] Yuriy Kornilov writes that the process of breaking down the structure of apartheid in South Africa has begun, but common sense and the events taking place in the country show it is too early to maintain this.

There was the great temptation to do so with the release from prison of a number of campaigners against apartheid, at the meeting of President de Klerk and Nelson Mandela, and the holding of the antiapartheid conference attended by 4,500 delegates [word indistinct] the idea arose, could this be a maneuver by the ruling circles in South Africa aimed at weakening the pressure on the apartheid system both within and without the country? Here is what the representative of the African National Congress [ANC] of South Africa, Max Moneni, had to say about this in Zimbabwe.

Yes, there are few reforms being carried out in South Africa, but I have to say that any system that feels the pressure or has been driven into a corner would have done the same [word indistinct], and anyway those reforms are not very significant.

It has been announced that black and white people in a number of suburbs can use the [words indistinct] soon to gather in the city's swimming pools, but you have only to look into the meaning of the law on the separate residence of races and you realize that if you are white, you can live in one suburb; if you are black, you live in another.

If a black goes into a white suburb, he or she is arrested. These are artificial reforms by the government. They cannot change the essence of the system. It is easier to think of [words indistinct] the struggle of the Africans organized by the Mass Democratic Movement, a change in the mood of the whites, the stand of the world community—all this is making Frederik de Klerk undertake reforms, says the ANC representative in Zimbabwe, Max Moneni.

The ANC believes that today as never before there is every possibility to put pressure on apartheid. The changes are inevitable.

Correspondent Views East Africa Refugee Problem

EA1912105989 Moscow International Service in Somali 1600 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Text] Ethiopian-Somali talks on refugees took place in Addis Ababa recently. The future of the thousands of Ethiopian refugees in Somalia and the many Somalis fleeing to Ethiopia temporarily was discussed during the talks. A program to enable the refugees to return to their home countries as of March 1990 has been worked out. Vladimir Borisov, Radio Moscow correspondent, comments on the situation of the refugees in East Africa.

The question of tribal conflicts, refugees, and instability in the region are interrelated. The three problems, whether on a large- or small-scale, exist in all the countries of the East African region. These problems harm relations between those countries. The Somali refugees, who have recently become the talk of the town, can be taken as an example. The Somali refugees are fleeing from the civil war raging in Somalia. The fleeing refugees have left behind their property and homes, and now face starvation. Some of those recognized by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees [UNHCR] have received assistance, while many wait in agony, and face endless suffering through lack of basic food and shelter. The influx of the Somalis into Kenya recently has made the government of that country nervous, because the Somalis fleeing from the civil war in Somalia are accompanied by bandits, who steal the Kenyan pastoralists' animals.

The compulsory registration imposed by the Kenyan Government on all people of Somali origin is seen by the Somalis as ethnic discrimination. This compulsory registration by the Kenyan Government has forced many Somalis who can be classified as illegal immigrants into neighboring countries, like Tanzania. They have not received a warm welcome in Tanzania. The Tanzanian Government has refused 340 Somalis political asylum. The Somali refugees are also causing a major problem in the Republic of Djibouti. The influx of Sudanese refugees from southern Sudan has caused considerable problems for the government and people of Uganda. The war raging in southern Sudan is between the rebel Christian and national movement on the one hand and the forces of the Muslim central government of Sudan on the other. Recently, the leaders of Kitgum District called on the UNHCR and the central government of Uganda to move the 5,000 Sudanese refugees stationed at (Ferestenge) to areas inside Uganda, far away from the Uganda-Sudanese border. The emergence of mafia-type activities at the camp led to mismanagement of food aid for the refugees. The food is given free to the refugees by the UNHCR. In these mafia-type activities in the refugee camp food was being sold illegally to people in some areas of Uganda opposed to the government.

These instances show that the question of refugees, whether political or economic, has got out of hand in the East African states. This clearly indicates that a lasting solution to the internal conflicts and the existing instability among the East African countries has to be sought. The governments of the region appear to have seen that there is a need to find a joint solution to the problems. In addition to the recent Ethiopia-Somalia talks on returning refugees, similar talks were held in Kampala, Uganda, between the Ugandan and Rwandan Government, on the question of Rwandese refugees in Uganda. Earlier, the Ugandan and Sudanese Governments held talks on refugee problems.

Finally, our commentator says that the question of refugees in East Africa can only be solved through a joint conference which could find a lasting solution to all the problems linked with the plight of refugees.

Zimbabwean ANU-PF Congress Holds Session

CPSU Central Committee Greeting

PM2012143989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[CPSU Central Committee message to Zimbabwe African National Union-Patriotic Front Congress]

[Text] To the Congress of the Zimbabwe African National Union-Patriotic Front [ZANU-PF]

Dear comrades!

The CPSU Central Committee cordially greets the delegates to the ZANU-PF congress, which will complete the process of uniting Zimbabwe's patriotic forces on a platform of national and social progress and strengthening the sovereignty and independence of the country.

Soviet Communists invariably support the development of friendly relations between our parties and peoples.

We wish the congress fruitful work.

The CPSU Central Committee.

Malkov Leads CPSU Delegation

PM2012151089 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "CPSU Delegation in Zimbabwe"]

[Text] Harare, 18 Dec—A CPSU delegation headed by N.I. Malkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of Chita Oblast CPSU Committee, arrived here on Sunday at the invitation of the Zimbabwe African National Union—Patriotic Front

(ZANU-PF). The delegation will take part in the ZANU-PF congress which is opening here.

East Europe

Reportage on Romanian Unrest, Government Reaction

Romanian Beam Reports Initial Unrest

AU2012125789 Moscow Radio in Romanian to Romania 1700 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Since Friday a number of Romanian cities have been faced with disturbances. The country's mass media remain silent in this respect.

The events, which are taking place in the northwestern part of Romania, can be judged only on the basis of statements made by a few foreign eyewitnesses, who arrived in Yugoslavia and Hungary.

According to their accounts, the disturbances began when representatives of the security forces took the priest of the Reformed Church, Laszlo Tokes, from his home in Timisoara.

Judging by the information provided by eyewitnesses, the demonstrations in Timisoara, Arad, Oradea, and Brasov turned into actions of a political nature.

According to reports by press agencies, a tense atmosphere prevails in Romania. It started after the clashes of the militiamen and soldiers with demonstrators in Timisoara.

The Yugoslav agency TANJUG reports that hundreds of people were killed and injured.

Romania has closed its borders with Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Hungary, and the USSR.

An abnormal situation has been created at border points.

The events in Romania have caused concern in other countries.

In Berlin the participants in the roundtable negotiations—representing all political forces in the GDR—have asked the Romanian Government to stop repressions.

The Polish Sejm protested against Romania's violation of human rights.

The Hungarian Parliament called on the Romanian Government to observe the commitments assumed within the framework of international accords.

During his visit to Brussels—answering questions of the REUTER agency in connection with how he views the events in Romania—USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Eduard Shevardnadze said he has only preliminary information. "I cannot say if indeed people died there; however, I want to express my profound regret," he said.

The Bulgarian authorities are trying to normalize the situation in the Ruse-Giurgiu area, at the border with Romania. This is in response to the measures taken by the Romanian authorities. On Monday in Giurgiu 60 Polish and 60 Bulgarian tourists were put into freight cars and transported back to Bulgarian territory. Romanian border guards manhandled a Polish and Bulgarian woman, BTA agency reported.

Civilian Resistance Noted

AU2012212189 Moscow in Romanian to Romania 1700 GMT 20 Dec 89

[From the news bulletin]

[Excerpts] Here is a news bulletin. [passage omitted]

News agencies report on antigovernment demonstrations in Romania. Citing eyewitnesses, the Yugoslav agency TANJUG says that clashes between the people and troops continued yesterday in Timisoara city. Shots could be heard. According to certain sources, the inhabitants captured a weapons depot in order to fight the troops. The latter are using tanks and helicopters. There were casualties. According to various reports, two other cities where unrest has been reported, Brasov and Arad, were surrounded by troops. [passage omitted]

Suppression of Demonstrations Noted

PM2012124289 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Vedrashko report under the general heading: "On the Situation in Romania"]

[Text] Bucharest, 19 Dec—The Romanian capital underwent a transformation last night. Reinforced joint military and militia patrols appeared in the streets. Soldiers in helmets and armed with submachineguns could also be seen in the district of the student hostels.

The situation in Romania has deteriorated in connection with the large demonstrations in Timisoara which took place last weekend and were suppressed by military units and the militia. According to conflicting reports, there were some deaths. The trenchant political slogans under which the inhabitants of Timisoara marched were aimed at changing the existing system in the country and carrying out speedy transformations.

International tourist communication with Romania has been disrupted. Yesterday Intourist's representatives in Romania were unexpectedly told that the reception of groups that were due to arrive from the USSR from 18 December through 5 January is being postponed "due to unfavorable weather conditions." Hundreds of Soviet tourists will have to change their immediate plans.

E. Europe Protests Crackdown

PM2112111789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS roundup: "Situation in Romania"]

[Excerpt] Dec 20—[Passage omitted] Prague—The CSSR Foreign Ministry has issued a statement expressing deep concern and a resolute protest at the use of the army and law and order forces to disperse demonstrations in Timisoara and other Romanian cities. The document contains the demand that the Romanian leadership adhere to the CSCE Final Act with regard to the observance of human rights.

Sofia—The BTA news agency has reported that a protest rally has been held near the Romanian Embassy in Sofia against the Romanian authorities' use of force to disperse demonstrations in a number of Romanian population centers. Students, teachers, and citizens took part in the rally and "expressed indignation at the dramatic turn of events in Timisoara."

The leadership of the Dimitrov Communist Youth Union Central Committee has adopted a statement protesting the use of force to disperse demonstrations by citizens in Timisoara and other Romanian population centers.

Warsaw—At a session of the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] Central Committee Politburo here on Tuesday, deep regret was expressed at recent events in Romania. A resolution by the Sejm, which all PZPR deputies supported, condemns the "Romanian authorities' repression" of peaceful demonstrators and expresses solidarity with the victims.

World Media Cited

PM2012164189 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 20 Dec 89 p 3

["Our own correspondent in Hungary" A. Kaverznev dispatch under general headline: "Unrest in Romania"]

[Text] Thousands of candles were lit by demonstrators in the Heroes' Square in Budapest on Monday night. An unusual situation, if only because representatives of the most diverse political forces took part in the meeting. The demonstration was organized by the Hungarian Democratic Forum. The crowd carried posters demanding the liberation of the Reformed Church clergyman Laszlo Tokes, who was arrested in the Romanian city of Timisoara.

The protest demonstration was prompted by the events in Timisoara and other population centers in western Romania at the end of last week. Contradictory reports are coming in from this area. The Romanian mass media are maintaining silence on the subject, reporting only the beginning of N. Ceausescu's official visit to Iran. Hungarian newspapers, on the other hand, are describing Timisoara as a battlefield. The following picture is emerging from Hungarian press and Western news agency reports.

Laszlo Tokes, a Hungarian by nationality, a Reformed Church clergyman, and a champion of the rights of the Hungarian national minority in Romania, was arrested by the security forces. Back on Friday some 200 local inhabitants formed a living chain around Tokes' house in an attempt to protect the clergyman and his family. Despite the authorities' warnings, the number of voluntary guards kept increasing and by midnight on Saturday there were several thousand of them. Among them were not just Hungarians, but also Romanians and Germans. The militia tried to intervene, but the crowd refused to disperse. Antigovernment slogans appeared. People were chanting: "Wake up, Romanian People!" and "Down With Violence!" Tokes was arrested.

Mass clashes between the demonstrators and the militia began. The demonstrators marched to the local Romanian Communist Party committee building. On the way they set fire to cars and smashed windows in an attempt to tear down or set fire to N. Ceausescu's portraits. His books were torn up and burnt. The Yugoslav news agency TANJUG reports that troops were used against the demonstrators and that the city is surrounded by tanks and armored vehicles. Telephone links have been cut. Security forces have fired weapons. People were shot at and knocked down by water cannon. There are conflicting reports about the number of dead. Between 300-400 is the figure most frequently mentioned in newspapers.

Romania has, practically speaking, closed its borders with Hungary and Yugoslavia.

A session of the Hungarian State Assembly has adopted a statement denouncing the methods used by the Romanian authorities against Tokes.

AGERPRESS Refuses Comment

LD2012163489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1512 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Bucharest, 20 Dec (TASS)—TASS correspondent Nikolay Morozov reports:

What is happening in Timisoara? Foreign journalists accredited in Romania continue to ask themselves this question. The central press continues to maintain total silence, neither confirming nor refuting the reports of the foreign mass media on events in this town in western Romania. Today's newspapers give detailed coverage of the visit to Iran by N. Ceausescu, secretary general of the Romanian Communist Party and president of the Socialist Republic of Romania, report the successes of Romanian industry, and draw the attention of party organizations to the need to strengthen ideological and political educational work in labor collectives.

"We have no knowledge about any events in Timisoara; there is no such information as that being transmitted by the foreign radio stations," declared the official representative of the Romanian agency AGERPRES, answering the repeated request of the TASS correspondent to comment on the reports of the foreign press. The official said it is "impossible" at the present moment to organize a trip to that town, even if accompanied by the AGERPRES official. Reinforced detachments of the order-keeping forces are patrolling the Romanian capital, protection of the government offices and enterprises has been strengthened, documents are being checked on the streets.

Romanian Silence Undermines Prestige

PM2012190589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Own correspondent V. Volodin dispatch: "Romania: Protracted Silence"]

[Text] Bucharest—Have the militia and troops in the Romanian capital been placed in a state of heightened readiness? There is a total lack of information about this.

There has been a noticeable increase in the number of armed patrols in the capital in recent days. You encounter them, five or six people strong, proceeding along the city's central streets and on the platforms of the Northern Station, and you see them outside administrative buildings and in districts on the outskirts of Bucharest. The highways on the approaches to Bucharest barred by screens with luminiscent inscriptions reading "Stop" complement the overall picture.

It should be pointed out that there is still not the slightest official explanation for the security measures taken: the closed borders with Hungary and Yugoslavia and other facts. Nor is there any explanation for the events in Timisoara, which remains inaccessible to foreign journalists.

Instructions forbidding foreign correspondents from interviewing Romanian citizens without special permission and forbidding Romanian citizens from associating with foreign citizens seriously hinder the possibility of separating the truth from the fabrications that inevitably arise in an atmosphere of silence.

Meanwhile, incoming reports of an unofficial nature, which, alas, it is impossible to check out, mention demonstrators supposedly injured and killed. I will not cite contradictory figures and estimates. I will only say that the real state of affairs in Timisoara is still unknown.

It is hard to explain the protracted silence of the official Romanian authorities, if you consider the fact that every day that passes deals a new painful blow to Romania's international prestige in the form of diplomatic demarches, official protests, and demonstrations outside the Romanian embassies in West and even East European countries. Silence gives grounds for very serious suppositions about the recent events in Timisoara and gives rise to contradictory rumors which spread with fantastic speed.

Ceausescu Blames Anti-National Elements

LD2012210789 Moscow TASS in English 2033 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Bucharest December 20 TASS—Romanian radio and television broadcast today Nicolae Ceausescu's address to the nation in connection with the events in Timisoare.

On December 16 and 17 he said several groups of hooligans organised protest actions in Timisoare to block the implementation of a legal court's decision. They attacked government offices and looted a number of houses and shops, Ceausescu said.

On December 17 they stepped up their activity against state and party offices, including against troops. Despite the efforts by the party and state bodies, the groups continued and further enhanced their destructive activity.

Late on December 17, Ceausescu continued to say, troops responded to attackers with firing warning shots. As the anti-national terrorist groups did not desist, troops were obliged, in conformity with the Constitution and other laws, to defend themselves, the public order and the city property, in fact to defend the order across the country against attackers.

On the basis of available data, it can be confidently stated, the Romanian leader said, that these terrorist actions were organised and unleashed with the support from imperialist, reactionary, irredentist and chauvinist circles and spy agencies from different countries.

According to Ceausescu, the aim of these anti-national provocative actions consisted in boosting unrest, destabilising the political and economic situation in the country, creating conditions for territorial dismemberment of Romania and the elimination of the socialist state's independence and sovereignty.

Bucharest Crowd Broken Up

LD2112123789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1155 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Bucharest, 21 Dec (TASS)—TASS correspondent Dmitriy Dyakov reports: Since early morning people have been walking past the TASS office as well as along all the streets adjacent to the center of the Romanian capital. From trucks they were handed portraits of Nicolae Ceaucescu and banners, and then they went on to Republic Square. There one young man told the TASS correspondent that a rally was to take place in support of the political course of the party, and to condemn the hooligan elements that caused the disturbances in the town of Timisoara.

After some time, however, the participants in the planned rally began to give up the posters and banners and disperse. It cannot be excluded that the rally has been cancelled, or is to be held in another place.

As has been reported, Ceaucescu, general secretary of the Romanian Communist Party, president of the Socialist Republic of Romania, stated in a speech yesterday evening on Romanian television and radio, that "several groups of hooligan elements, in order to obstruct the carrying out of a lawful judicial decision, organized a number of demonstrations and incidents in Timisoara, attacked state institutions, and destroyed and plundered a number of buildings and shops." He asserted that these "terrorist actions were organized and started with the support of imperialist, reactionary, irredentist, chauvinist circles from different foreign countries."

Today all the Romanian newspapers have published, side-by-side with the presidential decree on the introduction of a special situation in the uyezd [in Russian, the lowest administrative division of a district] of Timis, reports about rallies and meetings, the participants of which condemned the initiators of, and participants in, the disturbances in Timisoara, almost at the same time as the speech by the country's leader was broadcast on television.

It has become known that rallies and meetings will also be held in all the country's uyezds.

The situation in the Romanian capital remains unpredictable. A meeting, nevertheless, took place on Republic Square. It was addressed, after several workers, by N. Ceausescu, secretary general of the Romanian Communist Party.

At the same time a large number of people gathered on the central highway of Bucharest Mageru, mainly young people. They are shouting out slogans against the current Romanian leadership. Your correspondent heard the bursts of tear gas grenades. The militia and security forces are breaking up the crowd. Similar clashes are also taking place on other streets in the center of the city.

Protest in Bucharest

LD2112143589 Moscow TASS in English 1428 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Bucharest December 21 TASS—Truckloads of troops and fire engines are massing in the centre of the Romanian capital.

Approaches to Republic Square have been closed by Romanian Army units. Police made an attempt to disperse demonstrators and to prevent new people from joining them, but failed. The inital crowd of several hundred protesters has swelled to several thousand.

The demonstrators are chanting: "Freedom" and "Down With the Dictatorship". They are stopping buses and other passing vehicles.

Sympathisers are cheering and applauding the main group of demonstrators.

Tanks are following soldiers toting submachine-guns who are pushing the demonstrators along Bucharest's main thoroughfare. Automatic fire can be heard. Panic stricken, people seek shelter inside building entrances and yards.

Zaykov: Events 'Not Unexpected"

LD2112145589 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] A senior Politburo member, Lev Zaykov, says the current developments in Romania were not unexpected. In an interview for Radio Moscow he said the Romanians were well aware of the general trend of democratization and of Soviet perestroyka, and their desire for perestroyka in Romania was understandable. He said the Romanians appeared to be unhappy over the continued administrative command method by the country's leadership.

Lev Zaykov said that as conditions were now, the process was a logical one and that the Romanian leadership must open a dialogue with the people rather than use force to subdue discontent.

Ceausescu 18 Dec Arrival in Tehran Reported

PM1912143789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Official Visit"]

[Text] Tehran, 18 Dec—Nicolae Ceausescu, president of the Socialist Republic of Romania, arrived in Tehran today on a 3-day official visit at the invitation of 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, president of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

In a brief statement on arrival, N. Ceausescu noted that questions of the development of bilateral cooperation and topical international problems of mutual interest will be discussed during talks with Iranian officials.

Says Iran Talks 'Good'

PM2112111989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Visit Over"]

[Text] Teheran, 20 Dec—The official visit to Iran by President N. Ceausescu of Romania is over. At the end of the talks with Iranian officials a number of documents on bilateral cooperation were signed. In a Tehran radio interview, N. Ceausescu termed the results of the talks "good." He stressed Romania's desire to develop relations with Iran in various spheres.

Today N. Ceausescu returned to Bucharest.

CSSR Premier Visits Moscow, Meets Leaders

Meets Ryzhkov

PM2112111189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Soviet-Czechoslovak Talks"]

[Text] M. Calfa, the chairman of the CSSR Government, was in the Soviet Union 20 December on a short working visit in accordance with a mutual accord.

Talks took place between N.I. Ryzhkov, the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and M. Calfa in which the foreign ministers of both countries, E.A. Shevardnadze and J. Dienstbier, also participated. Problems of the political, economic, and social development of both countries and the prospects for bilateral cooperation were at the centre of attention.

N.I. Ryzhkov described the features of the current stage of perestroyka in the USSR, the transformations in various spheres of the life of Soviet society, and the development of democratization and glasnost. He emphasized the significance of the second USSR Congress of People's Deputies, during the course of which such fundamentally important issues as urgent measures for the recovery of the Soviet economy, the stages of economic reform, approaches to elaborating the 13th 5-Year Plan, and topical problems of improving the USSR's political system and renewing the Soviet federation are being considered.

M. Calfa reported on the situation in Czechoslovakia and the activities of the government of national accord he heads. The implementation of deep reforms in the political, social, and economic spheres has begun in the CSSR.

The government is working actively on a program of actions for the immediate future. Its aim is to lead the CSSR onto the path of stable socioeconomic progress in a short time. In the context of the changes taking place, the Czechoslovak side attaches great significance to cooperation with the Soviet Union.

The situation existing in the country demands of the government the unification of all forces in favor of Czechoslovakia's development in the spirit of its historically evolved democratic traditions. The events in the CSSR in November to December of this year, M. Calfa stressed, mark society's complete break with the administrative-command system and the country's transition to the path of transformations.

M. Calfa reported that the statement of the Soviet Government regarding bringing the troops of the five Warsaw Pact states into the CSSR in August 1968 was received with satisfaction in Czechoslovakia. An agreement was reached on beginning in the first half of January 1990 talks on Soviet troops on the territory of the CSSR. The sides agreed that the problems connected with the events of 1968 call for thorough research, with the participation of scholars and historians of both countries.

The heads of governments were of the one opinion that Soviet perestroyka and the processes of renewal in Czechoslolvakia are imparting a new quality to the development of bilateral ties. With all the specific features of the situation in both countries, a great deal in common exists in the approach to the solution of the problems in sociopolitical, economic, and spiritual life, and there is mutual readiness to increase bilateral cooperation in all spheres.

Typical features of it are mutual respect for each other's interests and views, the principles of equality of rights, noninterference in internal affairs, mutual benefit, and mutual assistance.

It was noted from the Soviet side that the changes taking place in the CSSR are being viewed in the Soviet Union as the result of internal processes that reflect the growing demands for a regeneration of the life of society.

The USSR, as was emphasized by N.I. Ryzhkov, sees Czechoslovakia as a close friend, ally, and neighbor with whom it is linked by broad multifarious ties with rich traditions. The Soviet side is open to close interaction with the new CSSR leadership and with all Czechoslovak political and public forces who are prepared for this.

Noting the fruitful, mutually-advantageous nature of Soviet-Czechoslovak economic and scientific-technical cooperation, the sides drew attention to the need to further improve the structure of trade turnover, the currency-financial mechanism of interaction, price-fixing, and improving the quality of mutually supplied production.

As a result of a discussion of questions connected with the restructuring of the mechanism of multilateral and bilateral cooperation and with the stage-by-stage transition to a new system of mutual settlements using freely convertible currency on the basis of world prices, agreement was reached regarding the setting up of a bilateral commission to work out the appropriate specific proposals.

During the course of a discussion on the international situation, the heads of government reaffirmed their coincidence of views on the changes taking place in Europe and throughout the world.

They were of one mind that the noticeably marked tendency in international relations of a lowering of confrontation and raising of the level of mutual trust were creating favorable prospects for the solution of radical problems of the present time, and above all, of questions of disarmament and guaranteeing security.

Both sides advocate further advancement of the Helsinki process, strengthening of the structures of cooperation, and establishing broad interaction among large and small countries of Europe in the cause of construction of the all-European home.

They consider necessary a strict observance of the inviolability of the borders that took shape as a result of World War II. Their integrity is the main condition of lasting peace, good-neighborliness, and mutual trust in Europe.

The heads of government stressed the important significance of the Warsaw Pact for maintaining a stable balance both in Europe and in relations between East and West overall. The sides advocated stepping up the political functions in its activity and strengthening interaction among allied states. The conviction was expressed that the establishment of contacts between political and military representatives of the Warsaw Pact and NATO would be in keeping with the interests of overcoming confrontation and building a more secure world.

In light of the major changes taking place in both countries, the visit, in the sides' opinion, has made it possible to check positions on fundamental questions of Soviet-Czechoslovak relations and to create the prerequisites for their successful development.

The talks confirmed the complete mutual understanding of the sides, their adherence to the new political thinking, and to the priority of common human values. They displayed the desire of the CSSR and USSR, preserving everything positive in their relations, to develop all-around cooperation, to make it more effective, and to strengthen mutual trust.

M. Calfa invited N.I. Ryzhkov to pay an official visit to the CSSR. The invitation was accepted with gratitude.

Also taking part in the talks were, on the Soviet side, S.A. Sitaryan, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; I.P. Aboimov, deputy USSR minister of foreign affairs; V.P. Lomakin, USSR ambassador to the CSSR; and on the Czechoslovak side, J. Rehorek, CSSR ambassador to the USSR, and other officials.

Soviet Troops Discussed

LD2012215689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2050 GMT 20 Dec 89

[From "The World Today" program presented by Igor Kudrin]

[Text] [Kudrin] Today Marian Calfa, chairman of the government of Czechoslovakia, was in Moscow on a short working visit. Before he flew home, our correspondent Sergey Rybin talked to him.

[Begin recording] [Calfa, in Czech with superimposed Russian translation] In the course of the conversation with Comrade Ryzhkov, he informed us about the present situation in the Soviet Union, the course of the second Congress of People's Deputies, and the main economic issues that must be resolved in the near future. For my part, I told him about the present state of affairs in Czechoslovakia, about the tasks facing our new government. Some other questions were touched upon regarding bilateral relations, particularly in the sphere of the economy. We did, moreover, exchange opinions on how CEMA will operate in the future. This range of questions was also discussed with Comrade Gorbachev as well.

[Rybin] As far as is known, the federal assembly has instructed you to discuss in Moscow the issue of the withdrawal of military—Soviet military—units from Czechoslovakia.

[Calfa] During the meetings in Moscow this issue was also touched upon, but to begin with I would like to say this: We have informed the Soviet leadership that we must set up a group of historians who will be engaged in the problems of the events of 1968. We want to obtain an objective explanation of what happened at that time. We are prepared to publish the results of this work. As far as the presence of Soviet troops in Czechoslovakia is concerned, we have agreed that talks will start at the foreign minister level. We think goodwill is being manifested on both sides, and this question will be resolved both in the interests of the Soviet Union and in the interests of our people. [end recording]

Meets Gorbachev

PM2112111589 PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Friendly Meeting"]

[Text] Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev received Czechoslovak Prime Minister Marian Calfa in the Kremlin 20 December. Calfa is in Moscow on a working visit.

During the conversation, held in an atmosphere of amicability and mutual understanding, M. Calfa spoke about changes in Czechoslovakia.

The program of the new Czechoslovak coalition government aims to develop democratic forms of sociopolitical life and economic activities in Czechoslovakia within the foreseeable future.

Czechoslovakia has turned towards a market-oriented economy in order to get more involved in the world economic processes.

In its foreign policy, Czechoslovakia, observing allied obligations under the Warsaw Treaty, will maintain relations with all countries in the interests of stability in Europe and the world.

New political and civic organisations and movements have intensified their activity in Czechoslovak society. A multiparty system has become a reality.

It is very important that the processes of change take place peacefully, without violating public order and the rights of citizens and without disrupting production processes.

The entire socialist world has gone into motion in order to adjust to the requirements of the times, Gorbachev said.

Transformations in many countries, with all their national characteristics and differences, are above all the manifestation of a common desire to create a more humane and socially fair environment for man, to tap the huge potential of the socialist system, he said.

It is important that in the process of rejecting dogmas and deformations there should not be a nihilistic rejection of what socialism has given to people. Democracy should not be replaced with demagogy, and some ideological stereotypes should not be replaced with other, no less erroneous ones, he said.

On the whole, Soviet society firmly adheres to its socialist choice. We shall not be pushed off the course by either conservative or left radical extremes, Gorbachev emphasised.

He also declared that the Soviet Union wants to purge its relationship with Czechoslovakia of all negative and extraneous aspects in order to replenish the rich assets of equal and mutually-advantageous cooperation accumulated jointly with Czechoslovakia.

It is in the interests of both countries that their economic ties become more effective. The settlement of accounts in convertible currency should gain wider use, and contemporary forms of economic ties, from the designing of products to their marketing, should be more actively encouraged.

The two leaders supported enriching their traditional interaction in science and technology, in culture and the arts and human contacts.

The stay of Soviet troops on the Czechoslovak territory was touched upon. Both sides expressed readiness to discuss this question constructively at talks scheduled to open in a few weeks' time.

This question can be conclusively decided in the context of the mutilateral agreement being drafted at the Vienna talks.

The talks will contribute substantially to the reliable strengthening of international stability and confidence in Europe.

At the end of the meeting, Gorbachev said the USSR wanted to develop broad ties with the peoples of Czechoslovakia, with everyone who cherishes the traditions of friendship and good-neigbourliness between the two countries.

Gorbachev wished success to the new Czechoslovak coalition government led by Marian Calfa.

Seen Off by Shevardnadze

PM2112110189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
21 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 1

[TASS report: "On Working Visit"]

[Text] Marian Calfa, chairman of the CSSR Government, arrived in Moscow 20 December on a working visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

At the airport he was received by N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; M.S. Shkabardnya, administrator of affairs of the USSR Council of Ministers; I.P. Aboimov, USSR deputy foreign minister; V.P. Lomakin, USSR ambassador to the CSSR; and other officials.

The welcoming party included J. Rehorek, CSSR ambassador to the USSR.

On the same day M. Calfa left the USSR.

At the airport he was seen off by E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister.

Shevardnadze, CSSR Counterpart Discuss Ties

LD2012174389 Moscow TASS in English 1724 GMT
20 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow Decmber 20 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and his Czechoslovak counterpart Jiri Dienstbier considered the present state and prospects of Soviet-Czechoslovak relations in light of the current world situation and changes in the two countries during their meeting in Moscow today.

The two ministers agreed on the urgent need for a qualitative improvement of Soviet-Czechoslovak cooperation in all spheres.

They said that the pooling of efforts in restructuring both bilateral economic relations and the mechanism of cooperation within the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance meets the interests of the peoples in the two countries.

The ministers pointed with satisfaction to the close identity of their views on key international issues. It was observed that the trend towards reduced confrontation in the international arena creates favourable prospects for broadening East-West relations.

In order to consolidate accomplishments in the all-European process, the two sides favoured enhancing security by reducing conventional armed forces, cutting and subsequently eliminating tactical nuclear weapons and adopting new-generatioin confidence building measures.

A Vienna meeting of foreign ministers from the countries participating in the CSCE process could give a major impetus to the successful conclusion of the Vienna talks. The foreign ministers' meeting would help find mutually acceptable solution to problems under discussion.

The two sides expressed their mutual understanding of the importance of promoting constructive contacts between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO in order to strengthen security and cooperation within the framework of the all-European process.

CPCZ's Calfa Supports Havel for CSSR President

PM2012124489 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Session Opens"]

[Text] Prague, 19 Dec—At the CSSR Federal Assembly session which opened here today, M. Calfa, chairman of the CSSR Government, who delivered the government's program statement, proposed the election of Vaclav Havel to the post of CSSR president.

As the head of government stressed, this would be the best way out of the present domestic political situation in the country.

CPCZ Central Committee Meets on Eve of Congress

LD1912121389 Moscow TASS in English 1157 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Prague December 19 TASS—A meeting of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee was held on the eve of the party's extraordinary congress due to begin on Wednesday. It has called upon the congress to elect a new general secretary by secret vote out of two or more candidates.

It was also recommended to cut by one third the number of Central Committee members and elect a 19-strong political executive committee instead of the present Presidium. The new body is to have a small secretariat. Slovak Communists have already elected a political executive committee at their extraordinary congress. It is also planned to reduce the number of Central Committee secretaries.

These plans were divulged by Josef Hora, spokesman of the Central Committee Presidium, who also said the Presidium nominated Karel Urbanek for the post of general secretary. Eighteen members of the present Central Committee were elected congress delegates.

The Democratic Forum of Communists (DFC), a political faction within the Czechoslovak Communist Party consisting of about 60,000 Communists, will not back Karel Urbanek's candidature.

"The DFC will consider his election as a bad omen," journalists were told by DFC spokesman Rudolf Prsevratil. He also said that some 50 DFC representatives from all over Czechoslovakia will take part in the congress. They demand the right to take part in the discussion and nomination of candidates to the Communist Party Central Committee.

"The results of the congress will show us whether the Czechoslovak Communist Party is able to build genuine socialism, whether it can become a modern political party of principle. If this does not happen, the DFC and probably hundreds of thousands of other Communists, will find it impossible to be members of the party any longer," Prsevratil added.

The Czechoslovak Communist Party congress is expected to have a decisive influence on the further development of the situation in the country and the party.

Ladislav Adamec Elected CPCZ Chairman

LD2012225589 Moscow TASS in English 2242 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Prague December 21 TASS—An emergency congress of the Czechoslovak Communist Party elected the party leadership late on Wednesday.

Ladislav Adamec was elected as chairman of the Czechoslovak Communist Party.

Vasil Mohorita was elected first secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee. These new party posts were instituted by the congress's decision.

The conrgess of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia continues work.

CPSU Central Committee Greets CPCZ Congress

PM2112094589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[CPSU Central Committee undated greetings message to Czechoslovak Communist Party Extraordinary Congress]

[Text] To the Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] Extraordinary Congress

Dear Comrades!

The CPSU Central Committee cordially greets the delegates to the CPCZ Extraordinary Congress.

Your congress is taking place at a crucial stage in Czechoslovakia's development. The new alignment of political forces, profound shifts in public consciousness, changes in the system of power—all this is still awaiting honest and courageous interpretation.

We are sure that the congress, in the best traditions of the Czechoslovak Communist and workers movement and the previous experiments at renewal, will adopt the correct decisions serving the people's interests.

We sincerely wish the CPCZ successes in defending and asserting the values of democratic, humane socialism and in uniting all forces of socialist orientation. We know from our own experience that the path of revolutionary changes is attended by many difficulties. But the goal—the building of lasting peace and the creation of a society of social justice—is worthy of great efforts.

[Signed] The CPSU Central Committee.

Dubcek Views Past, Future of CPCZ

PM1912165889 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 50, 10 Dec 89 p 8

[Telephone interview with former Czechoslovak Communist Party chief Alexander Dubcek in Prague by MOSCOW NEWS editor Yegor Yakovlev in Rome on 30 November: "To Look Ahead"; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] MN's [MOSCOW NEWS] Editor-in-Chief Yegor Yakovlev visited Rome last week. He was told by the Italia-Radio journalist Yolanda Bufalini that Alexander Dubcek, who is now in Prague, would like to talk to him. This took place in a 40-minute telephone conversation from the studios of Italia-Radio on November 30. With minor cuts the transcript is given below. The conversation was broadcast by the station.

Yakovlev: Hello, I'm happy to hear your voice. I admit, I'm very excited: this conversation for me personally confirms the fact that conscientiousness and truth sometimes triumph, though we don't generally see confirmations of the fact too often.

Dubcek: If you feel excited, try to imagine what I and my friends are going through. Of late, MOSCOW NEWS, IZVESTIYA, and other Soviet publications are carrying more and more articles about the year 1968, and I feel very gratified. These are attempts to somehow solve the problem which remains a stumbling block here and throughout the socialist camp.

Yakovlev: I can hear that you've not forgotten your Russian, though you had a good reason to forget it. Can you describe briefly what you've gone through during the 21 years and three months, from August 1968 until November 1989?

Dubcek: My Russian does not obey me the way it did before. In my internal "computer" I'm now obliged to translate some things from Czech into Russian. I haven't used my Russian for a long time. I would be happy to talk Russian more often.

Yakovlev: I hope you'll brush it up.

Dubcek: The past years for myself, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, and the entire socialist movement have been rather difficult. It was a time when the search by Communists for more attractive ideas—primarily as regards younger generations—was put on hold. It's a great pity that in the past we could not find understanding among those who at the time were at the head of the CPSU and the Soviet state, and the four other socialist states. In 1968 we embarked on an unexplored road which was nevertheless socialist in form and content. It found support among the people, and among the entire socialist movement of Europe. But steps were taken in order to suppress not only the new idea—the building of socialism with a human face, but also in order to halt the elaboration of new approaches to the solution to questions which were common to the socialist community. I think that it was no accident that such a movement developed precisely in Czechoslovakia: We had the optimal conditions for that—an industrial country with democratic traditions. Hence the support the movement received from the people. However, our socialist allies refused to see the main point of our programme; they didn't wish to see it, and instead saw in everything only negative aspects, and didn't wish to understand the most important thing. Our main task was to put the Communist Party in the vangard of the solution of issues that had come to a head in society. Not only within the party but in society as a whole. This situation came about in 1968 because the centre's actions were in harmony with popular demand. The support enjoyed by the party then looks like a dream today. What is going on in our countries today bears no comparison with what was taking place in 1968. The unity between the party and the people at that time looks incredible today.

Yakovlev: I would like to hear your assessment of what is happening in Czechoslovakia. What are the grounds for optimism and pessimism?

Dubcek: I would have said there is a great upswing in the democratization of society. The party is under outside pressure: In these 20 years and four congresses, the Brezhnev- and Suslov-minded individuals and Stalinists are entrenched in it. That the party is being pressured from outside with demands for replacing its leaders attests to the fact that in recent years the party has failed to earn respect and popularity. People are turning their backs on the party. This is the saddest toll of the past two decades.

It's hard to say what future awaits the party. Changes in the Presidium are a positive thing. But the Central Committee and the local committees still act on the old lines. They still don't see that the party cannot order society about. The party is part of society and it cannot in any way rise above society. Tremendous damage has been done to the party's prestige, and it now has to be won back.

Yakovlev: I'm in Rome to cover Mikhail Gorbachev's visit, as part of the press team. When Gorbachev called the team for evening tea yesterday, the discussion repeatedly touched on Czechoslovakia. Your name was also mentioned. Yevgeniy Ambartsumov, who asked me to give you his best regards, said that the people of the "Prague spring" have preserved their socialist ideals and orientation, and that this was important for Czechoslovakia. Do you agree with Ambartsumov?

Dubcek: Socialist ideals are the most important thing we should keep. Government by the people, humanism, the individual—these things should always be in the foreground. In the past years, alas, these things have largely been lost here in Czechoslovakia. Today these values are again gaining the right to exist, but in a situation far more difficult than 20 years ago. These two decades are now in the past and we should now give thought to design further ways of socialist development. The party should find its bearings in changed conditions. It must find a new road in time, although we are facing formidable difficulties.

Yakovlev: "What sort of experiences of the "Prague spring" can still be of value to today's Czechoslovakia?

Dubcek: The programme of action first and foremost. The question of pluralism—something that sets society in motion—was central to it. Now that the party has suffered a huge loss, it is useful to observe other movements, including those emerging today, take a constructive approach towards Czechoslovak society. This is one thing. The other is economic reform. Twenty years ago we had a law on enterprises ready which was deeper and more sophisticated than the one that has just passed through parliament. It had to wait 20 years. This is just one example of what our society has lost.

On one occasion, at the October Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, I raised a question that concerned all of us very much: the party must not rule. The ruling is done by the government, the state, and other bodies. If not, why have a government? The party's job is to map out development, to foresee and solve problems. If that is its role, people will follow it of their own free will. And it is wrong if the party does this job only when compelled, when something or someone comes along to make it do it.

This problem has not been fully solved to this day. I think our party should be more open to those new trends that have emerged among socialists of Western Europe, Sweden, for example. While the reform movement there was going strong, we remained in our own shell, out of touch with the socialist movement in Europe. This movement's experience should be heeded. I'm telling you about this as a former party functionary who now only watches this movement from the sideline. In fact our programme was of great interest to both communist and socialist parties of Europe. At the same time I came to hear and read often: "You are a threat to the socialist community, the Warsaw Treaty." These claims, I can assure you, were unfounded, they were based on conjectures. Our view was clear-cut and had nothing to do with inventions which served as the basis for invasion.

Yakovlev: How much longer are you going to stay outside the party?

Dubcek: I'm trying not to think of this because what happened to me still pains me. Like my comrades who have travelled a hard and tiring road, I can only think of what to do next. This is of course for younger people to decide. They of course may be given advice if they want it. It is hard to say how and in what position I can really be useful. It's hardest to speak about myself. It's up to other people.

Yakovlev: Still it's up to each individual to decide about party membership.

Dubcek: This is not so. I didn't decide anything when I was expelled from the party. I was expelled in my absence without having been allowed to attend the session of the Presidium of the Central Committee where this matter was discussed. Neither was I allowed to speak at the plenum of the party Central Committee. I don't think it would have changed anything if I had spoken, but I would have been able to look in the eyes of those who said at that time they were consolidating the party. They claimed throughout these 20 years that the military invasion was internationalist assistance, that it made friendship between the Soviet and Czechoslovak peoples stronger. Greater damage couldn't have been inflicted. I'm too emotional. And when someone is overemotional, he can't give good counsel. If three-quarters of the party members were expelled for disagreeing with the military solution, for their refusal to renounce the Programme of Action—this accounted for 63 percent of the members who'd been in the party for more than 20 years—you can imagine how they quit the party. Nothing needs to be said about how this affected society on the whole, to say nothing about the difficulties we face today.

Yakovlev: I'm sorry for the embarrassing question. Being in or out of the party doesn't just depend on our own will. And the last question: What would you like to see Soviet-Czechoslovak relations to be?

Dubcek: I would like to see them as they remained throughout history. In this respect, Czechoslovakia is rather an exception: What we call "Russophilia" has deep roots in our soil. And there were no events in history that could poison relations between our peoples and the peoples of the Soviet Union. What happened 20 years ago was a military invasion (I'm sorry I can't call it anything else)—this is a dark stain. Worse couldn't have happened. I'd rather not discuss the subject, I find it hard to talk. (Dubcek's voice cut off, and this was not because the line went bad.—Yakovlev)

Yakovlev: MN published in its recent issue a letter Daniil Granin wrote to his Czech friends. He said that what happened in Czechoslovakia in August 1968 was his festering wound. I think this applies to very many Soviet people. It oppressed us, too, please understand.

Dubcek: I understand, and let's look to tomorrow.

Prague Party Chief Cited on Crisis in CPCZ

PM2012193189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
20 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[Dispatch by PRAVDA special correspondents S. Vtorushin and A. Krushinskiy: "On the Way to Renewal"]

[Text] Prague—An enormous responsibility rests with delegates to the extraordinary Communist Party of Czechoslovakia [CPCZ] congress. The future of the party, which is in deep crisis, depends on the decisions they adopt. Why has this crisis occurred, what worries ordinary Communists most of all, and in what kind of conditions are they now having to work? In order to find the answers to these questions, we went to the Prague city party committee.

It has greatly changed, and the changes are evident starting from the entry into the building. Instead of the sentry, a nice old man now sits at the entrance, politely explaining how to the find the office you want. It is clear from his attitude to visitors that there are not so many of them these days. All is quiet and empty in the high, echoing corridors of the city party committee. Acting First Secretary Viktor Pazler, with whom we had arranged a meeting, spoke in a croaky voice, with difficulty:

"This is a bad time to have a sore throat. I have to see people and address labor collectives."

Pazler looked tired. We asked why the city party committee had no first secretary and whether he was filling in other positions as well?

"The old leadership has resigned and we must hold a city conference in order to elect new leaders. It has been decided to hold this conference after the congress, in early January."

The situation in the city party organization, which numbers 152,000 Communists and is the biggest in the country, is extremely complicated. As many as 12,000 people have already applied to leave the party. More than 200 party organizations at enterprises and institutions have announced that they are disbanding. From 31 December the activity of CPCZ bodies and organizations is to cease in the Army, border troops, Ministry of Internal Affairs troops, subunits of the national security corps, and a number of state institutions. Viktor Pazler believes that the situation still has not reached the highest point of the crisis. If the Prague city organization keeps even half of its members, it will be good.

So, why has the crisis occurred?

"Because a gulf developed between the party leadership, its apparatus, and ordinary members," V. Pazler said. "The CPCZ did not have a democratic mechanism for the promotion and renewal of cadres. Everything was decided by the apparatus. A person appointed to office was, in fact, given life tenure. He did not have to struggle for anything. It was believed that if the party's leading role was enshrined in the Constitution, this automatically assumed its permanent authority in society."

Some attempts to study public opinion have been made, however. A corresponding commission was set up in the CPCZ Central Committee a year ago. V. Pazler became a member of this commission. It proposed a considerable number of sober, realistic decisions. Some of its members spoke out in favor of dialogue with the opposition and permission to hold rallies and demonstrations. Pazler was one of them. But their proposals found no support in the CPCZ leadership. It regarded the opposition as a handful of renegades with no support among the people. The leadership feared the processes taking place in neighboring countries, where, as far as it was concerned, ways to eliminate socialism rather than renew it were being sought.

But new people joined the CPCZ leadership at the end of November. We asked Viktor Pazler why they had failed to get the situation under their control.

"Because right from the start they took a cautious, wait-and-see attitude. Instead of decisively getting rid of people who had besmirched Communists' honor and of everything standing in the way of the party, they tried to retain the party's unity at all costs. The new leadership's actions have been inconsistent. At many regional conferences Ladislav Adamec, the former head of government, has been nominated for the post of president. But the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium has not reacted to this at all. In the present situation, however, it is more important than ever before that Communists take a clear, precise stand on all questions. Hesitation, irresolution, and inconsistency in action are having serious repercussions on the party and its authority. Even the results of recent regional conferences, at which congress delegates were elected, have not been generalized and brought to the attention of party committees. We here in the Prague city party committee, for example, do not know how they went in other organizations."

Where does the solution lie, what must be done to overcome the crisis? Viktor Pazler believes that it would be difficult to restore the party to life in the form in which it previously existed. It has lost the people's trust to a considerable extent. The party must change its structure, its policies, and possibly even its name. These proposals have been put forward at many regional conferences.

It is hard to predict the congress decisions from this point in time. One thing is clear, however: There will be a keen struggle between the representatives of the different views and trends that have not only manifested themselves, but registered as official organizations.

"I firmly believe that the crisis in the party is temporary," Viktor Pazler said as we left. "It will emerge from this crisis strong and renewed. Czechoslovak society cannot be conceived of without a communist party. It holds an indispensable place in this society. It must be the party of the working class and all the working people."

FRG's Kohl Visits GDR, Meets Leaders

Meets Modrow in Dresden

PM2012191189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Working Visit"]

[Text] Dresden, 19 Dec—FRG Federal Chancellor H. Kohl's 2-day working visit to the GDR began today. He arrived in Dresden accompanied by a number of federal ministers.

The central event of the visit was today's German-German summit meeting. The two heads of government, H. Modrow and H. Kohl, discussed questions connected with further developing relations between the GDR and the FRG. This is the first such visit since the renewal process began in the GDR.

Within the framework of the meeting, GDR Foreign Trade Minister G. Beil and FRG Economics Minister H. Haussmann signed an agreement on setting up a joint GDR-FRG economic commission and also an agreement on economic and industrial cooperation between the two countries.

A plan of cultural cooperation between the two German states for the period 1990-1991 was also signed.

The sides reached the accord that a working meeting will take place in the FRG between H. Modrow and H. Kohl.

At the joint press conference, H. Kohl stressed in answer to journalists' questions that "good results were achieved" during the dialogue. The sides have drawn closer in their views on certain issues. However, there is still a great deal of work to be done before the next meeting. H. Modrow described the meeting as "the beginning of German-German relations on a totally new basis." These relations will go far beyond the limits of existing treaties.

H. Modrow and H. Kohl issued a statement in which they speak in favor of broadly developing bilateral relations and creating the appropriate treaty regulation. They are unanimous that a treaty on cooperation and good neighborliness should be concluded.

They reached ageement that official representatives of the two governments will begin talks immediately with the aim of drafting the text of this treaty. They have expressed the intention of signing it in spring 1990.

At the joint press conference H. Modrow stressed that a great deal of attention was devoted to the joint responsibility for peace, the continuation of the Helsinki process, disarmament and arms control, and GDR foreign policy. The head of the GDR Government announced that a new border crossing will be opened at the Brandenburg Gates in Berlin before Christmas. From 24 December, citizens of the FRG and West Berlin will be able to visit the GDR without the need to obtain a visa.

Urges 'Prudence' on German Unity

PM2012191589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Own correspondent V. Lapskiy report: "GDR-FRG: Common Responsibility"]

[Text] People on both sides of the Brandenburg Gate, which will be opened on Christmas Eve for the visaless passage of tourists from East to West Berlin and back, are animatedly discussing the results of the German-German top level meeting.

In a joint report, Hans Modrow and Helmut Kohl evaluated their first meeting as a good beginning on the way to a treaty community of the GDR and the FRG; it has been decided to prepare the text of the corresponding treaty by next spring. Both leaders are unanimous that the GDR and FRG bear special responsibility for preserving stability in Europe. They must act cautiously and circumspectly, taking account of the interests of their neighbors in East and West.

Economic questions were the center of attention in the talks. The leaders of the two governments agreed to set up direct economic ties and create joint ventures (until recently not a single such venture existed). The GDR pledged to draw up without delay a legal basis for the protection of foreign investments. The FRG, in turn, is ready to take new steps to develop relations in the economic sphere. A joint economic commission is being set up to coordinate cooperation.

The heads of government agreed to hold the next meeting in no more than 2 months' time.

H. Modrow and H. Kohl expounded their positions on the question of Germany's unification. In the interests of European security it is necessary to preserve two German states, H. Modrow said. H. Kohl reminded him of his 10-point program as the long-term orientation of Bonn policy.

After a news conference the FRG chancellor laid a wreath in the ruins of the Frauenkirche church, destroyed in 1945, to the memory of the victims of the war and then addressed the thousands of people of Dresden who had gathered. He confirmed his fidelity to the idea of German unity but, at the same time, called for restraint and prudence: It is necessary to take a very serious attitude to the historically justified fears and concern of neighbors. The German house, he said, must be erected under a European roof. We want people to remain in their motherland and find their happiness there, he continued. We respect what you are doing for the country's future.

GDR and FRG flags, as well as small white flags as an appeal to avoid violence, fluttered over the gathering. Exclamations were heard from all sides, calling for a united Germany and for the GDR's sovereignty to be preserved.

A thousands-strong demonstration was held in the GDR capital, in the city center, Tuesday evening. It was held under the slogan "Against the Unification of Germany." Representatives of many parties and mass movements spoke, including "New Forum," "Democracy Now," and the Socialist Unity Party of Germany-Party of Democratic Socialism [SED-PDS]. It was stated that in order to renew the country it is necessary to work hard and deal a rebuff to renascent nationalism and neo-Nazism and to hostility toward foreigners. The rally was also addressed by SED-PDS Chairman Gregor Gysi. He urged: "Let us preserve friendship with all the peoples of Europe, including those for whom things are now going very badly: I mean the Romanian people in particular."

French President F. Mitterrand arrives in the GDR Wednesday on a state visit.

Soviet Army Helps Alleviate GDR Freight Delays

PM2012151689 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
19 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent M. Podklyuchnikov report: "Trains Will Run on Schedule"]

[Text] Berlin, 18 Dec—The opening of the GDR's borders has made more work for the railmen. In the month since the government decision, more than 12 million visas have been issued for private trips to the FRG and West Berlin. Many millions of people have made such trips. The flow of travelers has been particularly rapid each weekend. Dozens of additional trains have been put on to transport them.

The considerable increase in the passenger flow has disrupted the schedule for shipments of national economic freight. Hundreds of freight trains have accumulated at junctions. Freight important to the uninterrupted supply of food and consumer goods to the population has been handled on a priority basis.

Motor transport has come to the aid of the railmen. Trucks belonging to transport combines, enterprises, and the army have been enlisted to help with shipments. Motor transport belonging to the Western Group of Soviet Forces has also taken part.

The flow of travelers visiting the FRG and West Berlin has now begun to decline. In the near future the railmen expect to make good their debts and bring freight trains back onto schedule.

Hungary's Nemeth Receives FRG Leader Kohl

PM2012121389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
20 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 8

[Report by own correspondent F. Lukyanov: "Promise To Support Reforms"]

[Text] "Exemplary" was the word West German Chancellor H. Kohl used to describe relations between Hungary and the FRG at a news conference at the end of his visit to Budapest.

In conversations with Hungarian Government head K. Nemeth, the chancellor expressed full support for the reforms in Hungary and in other East European countries, promising to continue economic and financial aid to Hungary. At the end of the talks in Budapest, a whole series of agreements was signed which envisage, in particular, enabling Hungarian workers to conclude labor agreements with FRG enterprises, which is very significant for Hungary at the moment since perestroyka of the structure of industrial production will mean a temporary reduction in the number of jobs available. The question of the FRG Bundestag's granting special assistance to Hungary and Poland to alleviate social problems was also raised at the talks.

Gorbachev Congratulates New MSZMP Chief

PM2012172789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
20 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[Mikhail Gorbachev undated message congratulating Gyula Thurmer on election as chairman of Hungarian Socialist Workers Party]

[Text] To Comrade Gyula Thurmer, chairman of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP]:

Esteemed Comrade Thurmer!

Accept my sincere congratulations on your election as chairman of the MSZMP. Allow me to wish the recreated MSZMP—in cooperation with all political associations and organizations devoted to socialist ideas—successes in work on the democratic renewal of Hungarian society and on strengthening the link between our countries' peoples.

M. Gorbachev

New MSZMP Chief Discusses Party's Tasks

PM2012204989 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Dec 89 First Edition p 3

[Interview with Gyula Thurmer, chairman of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party, MSZMP, by TASS correspondent A. Saliyev in Budapest: "Gyula Thurmer: 'We Are Open to Dialogue.' Hungarian Socialist Workers Party Chairman on the Party's Immediate Tasks"; date of interview not given; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Budapest—The first stage of the 14th MSZMP Congress has ended. Gyula Thurmer, 36 years old, was elected party chairman. A TASS correspondent met with the Hungarian Communists' new leader at the request of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA:

[Thurmer] The chief task of this congress was to set the party on its feet organizationally, to discuss and adopt the new statutes, and to elect the new leadership.

During the preparations for the congress we experienced certain difficulties connected with the fact that our movement's members came to the party with different experiences in life, at different ages, and with different ideas about the paths leading to socialism. There were personal ambitions which sometimes hampered the party's interests. But the congress has confirmed the MSZMP's unity, consolidating this by adopting new statutes. The MSZMP Statutes are distinguished by high democratism, the decisive role is allocated to primary party organizations, party members themselves can and must resolve all questions, and only a narrow range of problems falls within the competence of the party's central organs. Another new element of the statutes is the fact that county and city committees are eliminated and coordinating bureaus set up instead, to which primary organizations will delegate their representatives. Decisions are adopted either by the Central Committee or by primary party organizations.

The party's leadership was elected, and the mood at the congress showed that its members understand the need to include new people in it, including young people. Reason and the rational desire for our party to be able to play an important role in Hungary's political life prevailed over the personal ambitions of certain comrades.

What do we want in the immediate future? First, to finish organizing the party ranks and to instill order in primary party organizations. Second, we must tackle whatever interests the Hungarian people and show how we can serve the interests of the Hungarian nation. We decided to continue the work of the congress at the end of January and the beginning of February next year in order by then to have prepared a political statement, which will be discussed in primary party organizations. The second stage of the congress will adopt that document. This time we will confine ourselves to a comparatively brief political document. Our positions on the question of social insurance, on the foreign debt problem, and on a large number of other problems will also be formulated in the very near future. Entering into businesslike talks with our fraternal Hungarian Socialist Party, our potential ally, is also viewed as an immediate task. The start of a dialogue with the trade unions is no less important a task. It is necessary to arrange international cooperation with other political parties which are close to us. The CPSU Central Committee's telegram to the Hungarian Communists' congress was greeted very warmly by the delegates, and we rated highly the fact that our Soviet comrades were the first to respond to our forum.

We would like to develop mutually advantageous, useful cooperation with the socialist countries' communist parties and with other parties in Europe, and we are, of course, open to dialogue with other socialist and social democratic parties and with any forces which support our ideas and our aspirations.

Bulgarian National Assembly Session Reported

PM2112093989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 16

[Own correspondent A. Kapralov dispatch: "Parliament Gets Down to Real Work"]

[Text] Sofia—That was the newspaper RABOTNICHESKO DELO's headline on the National Assembly session. S. Todorov, chairman of the National Assembly, put it even more definitely: "This is the end of a session that was unthinkable under the totalitarian regime." The parliament has started to work in the way required by the Constitution and expected by the people.

Parliament approved the law on meetings, rallies, and demonstrations at its first reading. It has been submitted for nationwide discussion along with the draft law on social organizations. As Justice Minister S. Daskalova noted in a speech at the session, the "totalitarian system did not need this law; it did not allow any opinion other than official opinion to be expressed." The draft states that citizens cannot be punished for taking part in meetings and demonstrations or for expressing their views at them. The procedure for setting up social organizations, which need not necessarily obtain the status of legal persons, has been highly simplified.

Army General D. Dzhurov, minister of national defense, has for the first time publicized the budget (1.605 billion leva) and size (107,000 men) of the Bulgarian People's Army.

On the first day of the session's work several thousand people assembled outside the parliament building, expressed their lack of respect for the National Assembly's work, and whistled at the deputies who came over to talk with them. Judging by the thousands of telegrams reaching the National Assembly and by the calm atmosphere around the parliament on the second day of its work, people regret what happened and realize that such actions can only destabilize the situation.

The National Assembly has adopted a declaration in response to the nervous reaction on the part of a population demanding the immediate repeal of the constitutional provisions on the leading role of the Bulgarian Communist Party. The declaration states that the proposal to repeal the aforesaid provisions is an important step on the path of asserting political pluralism and building a democratic state. A final decision on this question will be made in line with constitutional procedures at the next session in January 1990.

Repression of Bulgarian 'Informals' Noted

90UI0216A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 14 Dec 89 p 7

[Article by Svetlana Balashova, SOVETSKAYA KULTURA correspondent: "For a Pure and Radiant Republic"]

[Text] It might seem that the days of rejoicing and the rapture of freedom in Bulgaria were somewhat quickly replaced by work days. The waves of rallies and strikes have abated, particularly the strikes of prisoners in jails. All of this was so unusual and forgotten that many compared the recent situation in the country with that which reigned in Bulgaria after 9 September 1944. There is a similarity with those days not only in the emotional fervor of the people, but also in the decisive actions of the new government. For efficiency they could be compared, perhaps, with the work of a revolutionary headquarters.

Changes have come to Bulgaria. An edict has been published on the reinstatement of 11 people in the Communist Party—those who in the times of stagnation fought for glasnost and perestroyka, and for which they suffered. Within 2 days two more names were added to this list.

Afterwards, Petr Mladenov, the new general secretary of the BCP [Bulgarian Communist Party], met with representatives of the Bulgarian intelligentsia. A frank conversation was held about the painful problems in the life of the country. The plenum of the BCP Central Committee then made a decision on personnel changes in the staff of the government. And on the following day a session of the People's Assembly confirmed the decision of the plenum. The meeting of the parliament was televised for the first time. The gallery for guests could not hold all of those who were invited: the diplomatic corps, journalists, and representatives of the public and the patriarchate headed by Patriarch Maksim.

In the evening of the same day a rally organized by city authorities was held that numbered into the thousands. The skepticism of many about the "measure from above" was dissolved by the progress of this demonstration—slogans were not coordinated and speakers were not planned. Among the speakers was General Slavcho Trynskiy, who gained the sympathy of the people with his tirade against Todor Zhivkov. The apotheosis of the rally was the playing of the Bulgarian anthem: It was sung by the famous opera singer Gena Dimitrova. The choir of many thousands joined in: "Dear Motherland! You are our earthly paradise!" These words perceptibly took on their primary meaning...

And the next day a rally of informal organizations was held. Thousands of residents of Sofia filled the square before the Aleksandr Nevskiy church and adjoining squares. It was not very long ago that the persecuted "informals" supported the program of the new government. One of the activists of this movement, writer Blaga Dimitrova, called this event a "great day." And the satiric poet Radoy Ralin proposed reviving the motto of Vasil Levskiy: "Fight for a Pure and Radiant Republic."

Nationwide support met the decision of the BCP Central Committee Politburo to transfer the personal residences of Todor Zhivkov (there were 30 of them) to orphan and children's sanatoriums, to student and worker collectives, and to tourist organizations, and his numerous hunting lodges and forests to the Ministry of Agriculture and the Intourist hunting organization "Murgash." There were also reports on the closing of the "Banner of Peace" center and the transfer of its facilities to the "Childhood" national fund, and the elimination of departmental restaurants. A decision was made not to hang the portraits of members of the Politburo in establishments. The position of government spokesman was instituted, and the first briefing was held with Bulgarian and foreign journalists. The government proposed making changes in the legislation of the country and, first of all, to examine draft laws on meetings and rallies, on public civic organizations, and on changes in the criminal code. Because of the numerous demands of citizens, reports were reinstituted on the salaries of members of the government and official party workers.

The changes also affected the second party of the People's Republic of Bulgaria—the Bulgarian Agricultural People's Union. Angel Dimitrov was elected the new secretary of the union, and new regulations are being developed. In December notice was given of the creation of the Union of Democratic Forces of Bulgaria, which consists of nine independent organizations, including the Club in Support of Glasnost and Perestroyka. "We want to destroy the totalitarian system, and not the society and its structure," said Zhelyu Zhelev, doctor of philosophical sciences and chairman of the union's coordinating council.

The swift progress of perestroyka in Bulgaria was prepared by all of the experience of perestroyka in the countries of socialism and, first and foremost, in the Soviet Union, and also by the movement in support of the idea of perestroyka started by the best representatives of the Bulgarian intelligentsia.

"Some perceived Soviet perestroyka, all of its stages, disruptions, and excruciating victories, as their own vital cause," explained philosopher Mariya Boykikeva, the first secretary of the Club in Support of Glasnost and Perestroyka, "and others—I have in mind the ruling clique—conducted a totally false and hypocritical line concerning the processes that were occurring in the USSR. We then decided to start perestroyka in Bulgaria from below. We adopted a declaration in which we said we are preparing perestroyka in Bulgaria, although at that time we did not even have a smell of it. This declaration had great significance for us; in this way we publicly announced that we will fight for changes. Our club in support of perestroyka was founded on 3 December 1988, and 112 persons enrolled in it. But as early as 4 November we were hit with a squall of repressions. Members of the club were summoned to investigative organs, and they were intimidated. Our telephone conversations were tapped, and frequently they were simply disconnected. Then expulsions from the party, discharges from work, and even arrests were initiated. Many were placed under surveillance..."

Not only members of the club were surveilled, but also those who had dealings with them. After one of the meetings with M. Boykikeva in the editorial office of NAUKA I ISKUSSTVO (where she supervised the department of philosophy, and from which she was soon released on pension, and later expelled from the party), after going into the street I suddenly sensed that I was being tailed—the persistent escort "accompanied" me to my home and disappeared. The next time, after meeting with another representative of the club, sociologist Zhelyu Zhelev, in the cafe "Kristall," I immediately picked up two "escorts." They followed me right to the door of the apartment...

I recall how a year ago in Sofia an exhibit was opened of the famous Bulgarian painter Svetlin Rusev, a former member of the BCP Central Committee, a former chairman of the Union of Painters, and a member of the ecological committee for saving the city of Ruse. The opening day was then turned into an action of solidarity with the painter, who was out of favor with the authorities; all of Sofia came to the exhibit. Not one of the elements of the mass media carried a report about this event. I tried then to submit an interview with the painter for publication in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, but it was not expedient for someone that this material appear on the pages of a Soviet newspaper.

It was about at this time that a reprisal was instituted against Stefan Prodev, the famous publicist, writer, and chief editor of the newspaper NARODNA KULTURA. He was quickly told to leave the newspaper. On leaving the editorial office, S. Prodev addressed his colleagues with these written parting words: "Try to preserve the spirit that was created by our common efforts—a spirit of frankness in work and sound ethics in relationships... The future of our society is in true perestroyka. Continue to work for it. I know how difficult this is, but for us as journalists there is no other way!"

It is with the participation of such people as Stefan Prodev, the discharged chief editors of other publications—LITERATURNYY FRONT, SOFIYSKIYE NOVOSTI, and TRUD—and members of the Club in Support of Glasnost and Perestroyka, the "Ekoglasnost" committee, and other informal organizations that today's Bulgarian perestroyka "from the top" was prepared. M. Boykikeva told me that it was for this reason that there is no need now for unnecessary euphoria. There is a very earnest working mood and a recognition of the main thing: We must move as fast as possible from a totalitarian state to a democratic state.

Anti-Soviet Feelings in Poland Viewed

PM2012151789 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 19 Dec 89 Second Edition p 3

[APN correspondent A. Bondar dispatch for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA: "Dangerous Impromptus. Why Anti-Soviet Actions Are Not Subsiding in Poland."]

[Text] Warsaw—I will be so bold as to claim that there have always been people in Poland who, putting it mildly, have harbored hostile feelings for their Eastern neighbor. But for some people this is probably unpleasant news. Until recently this kind of information was safely tucked away behind a screen of reciprocal vows of indestructible, fraternal friendship. However, it is necessary to talk about this openly because today west of the Bug River anti-Sovietism has suddenly spilled over like overheated beer from a bottle.

But to begin with, two reservations. The bulk, the overwhelming proportion of Polish society has a favorable attitude toward us. I do not know anyone among the Soviet people working here who does not have friends among the Poles ready to help in every way. However, like it or not, the atmosphere taking shape here is such that sometimes it requires courage to openly admit sympathies for our country. And second, Tadeusz Mazowiecki, Poland's noncommunist premier, repeats: We are neighbors and must live like neighbors, respecting each other. Anti-Sovietism is not in the interests of the state. Lech Walesa put it even more bluntly recently: Anti-Sovietism has to be viewed as a provocation. This is pointed and firm, is it not? But...

A little Polish girl who simply loved to play with my dog when I took it for a walk now always runs away, leaving the dog perplexed. He does not understand why for some time her parents have been calling her to come in whenever we take our walk. A trifle? But it hurts even more than the discussions about "Who is right, and who is to blame?" in which one must take part.

On my desk there is a copy of GAZETA WYBORCZA, Solidarity's popular newspaper. It carries a report about the latest demonstration against the presence of our forces on Polish territory. Naturally, this question must be resolved, and the sooner the better. Warsaw has declared its support for our efforts to turn the Warsaw Pact into an open organization that would renounce military confrontation, provided that NATO does likewise. This is accompanied by spiteful slogans which rhyme in Polish and are used during demonstrations.

The most innocent of them would translate approximately as: "Tanks Into the Volga!"; "Stench Go Back East!"; "The Red Army Has Been With Us Since the Cradle"; and, of course, the traditional "Soviets Go Home!"

Attitudes to Feliks Dzerzhinskiy may vary. However, it was not a pleasant sight for me to see his monument in Warsaw destroyed in November. The point is not even that this was interpreted as a great symbolic end to the socialist chapter of the development of Poland. To the roar and applause of the assembled crowd, the monument, dangling on a rope, swayed in the air, resembling a hanged man before it broke up into three parts and crashed down on the asphalt disintegrating into a heap of rubble. The unpleasantness lay in the destruction itself. It was presented as an accident, as it were: Specialists had miscalculated the strength of the material.

Then the Lenin monument in Nowa-Huta was dismantled. It has been said that all these excesses are a natural reaction of people who have obtained access to the whole truth. Possibly. Although the best impromptu is an impromptu that has been rehearsed in advance. Destruction has never been a creative force. It is enough to take a look at our own country. It is true also that a certain amount of anti-Sovietism is objectively assisting the current changes—as a safety valve in a critical situation. A Moscow acquaintance who used to work in Poland paid us a visit. She went shopping and came back upset. "You could encounter hostility in the old days, too. But on this occasion the store clerk served me with such suppressed hate and mockery that it made me feel guilty for the whole Polish crisis and all the Polish problems put together."

And so? When the new people came to power, wholesale criticism of everything that went before, a settling of accounts with the past set in in Poland. Who is to blame for the crisis, for the disintegration of the economy? The new authorities have found a scapegoat: It is the communists, the barren communist idea which the Soviets brought into the country on their bayonets. Recently a Solidarity activist stated in a Western radio broadcast: Since it was the USSR which foisted this system on us, let it now bear part of our debt. Or better still, let the Polish debt to the Soviet Union be written off; that would only be fair.

It is true that every Pole who has visited the USSR has friends there and values them. They demonstrate this by inviting them to Poland. However, it is also true, unfortunately, that in day-to-day thinking the idea is taking root that everything that is east of the Bug is the source of many troubles and tragedies of the past.

In the Poles' opinion, the admission of the USSR's guilt for the death of the Polish officers at Katyn has been delayed for so long as to be unseemly. There is a growing conviction in Poland that those connected with the tragedy in the Katyn forest near Smolensk still survive and wield influence in our country. The Soviet side preserves a silence, saying neither yes nor no. In Poland everyone, and I am not exaggerating, is convinced that the Polish officers in 1940 were shot by our "organs."

Sooner or later the dust will probably settle. However, if in a house only one room is kept tidy, the other room will always be dusty. This applies here, too. We must not keep silent. Otherwise the myths will not disperse. We must finally state our case. Articles have already appeared in the Polish press glorifying Pilsudski's march on Kiev in 1920 as an attempt to bring freedom to the East. However, the fact that subsequently our troops pushed back his legions as far as Warsaw is assessed unequivocally as... aggression. The myths are doing their job. In day-to-day contacts people refuse to accept that there is a "White Book" on 1920 and that some of its pages are unpleasant for the Poles. In Poland people now speak with reverence about the Home Army which came under the jurisdiction of the Polish Government in London during the war. It is true that it contributed to the victory, although this was not mentioned for a long time. However, too little and too late has also been said about the fact that there were acts of sabotage on the part of the Home Army against the Soviet Army, and that many of our officers and men were shot in the back. In Lithuania, too, it left many people with bad memories. Not much has been said about this either. On the other hand, people here are asking why there are anti-Polish sentiments in Lithuania.

In short, there is plenty to discuss in order to make the wounds, inflicted by claims and counterclaims, heal. However, both we and the Poles must learn to read the dark pages from both angles. Otherwise, there will be no results.

...I can still see before me the confused, hurt faces of our veterans in Deblin, which I visited twice with them this year. Fascists killed around 100,000 of our POWs in this concentration camp. Those who were with me miraculously survived. What a reception they were given at the beginning of the year! Yet at the inauguration of the memorial park in September there was already the cold breath of alienation.

It is true, though, that one stereotype in our relations collapsed, or at least was considerably shaken. It was regarded as a self-evident truth in Poland that the Soviet Union was economically plundering the Poles. There was no point even trying to argue about this. However, now the government of Tadeusz Mazowiecki, whom the Poles have no reason not to trust because it is noncommunist, has declared after talks in Moscow: If world prices were used in our current trade exchanges, Poland would have to find an additional substantial sum of money. A sum in the region of $1.5 billion was cited. There was also conjecture that the sum in question is considerably higher. Naturally, it will be necessary to switch to new conditions. However, it was stated that this had better be done gradually, and it is a very good thing that the USSR is willing to do this. To some extent, this had the effect of a cold shower on many of the hotheads.

Our relations with Poland are at a crucial stage at the moment. Our countries are sentenced to be neighbors. And there is a chance to be good neighbors, provided that there are no dark pages in our relations, which through some misunderstanding are still being referred to as "blank spots." Otherwise, there is no point asking: What is there at the end of the road? Is there something worthwhile or not? Because this could go unnoticed.

West Europe

Shevardnadze on Thatcher-Gorbachev Contacts

LD2012230989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 20 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Our correspondent Vsevolod Shishkovskiy has sent a report from London:

[Shishkovskiy] The talks that have been conducted for several hours by Margaret Thatcher, the prime minister of Great Britain, and USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, came to an end late yesterday evening at 10 Downing Street in London.

At the end of the meeting, they made a statement for the press. After expressing profound satisfaction with the exchange of views that had taken place, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher declared that both sides are determined to take all steps to assist the strengthening of the stability of Europe, and of peace throughout the world, on the basis of the Helsinki accords. We think, she said, that there are now good opportunities for an expansion of cooperation between the countries of East and West in various fields for the benefit of all peoples. Margaret Thatcher again affirmed her support for the restructuring processes in the Societ Union and wished them every success. I am very much looking forward, said the prime minister, to my upcoming trip to the Soviet Union in June next year, and I hope that it will be successful. In conclusion, Margaret Thatcher wished all the peoples of the Soviet land peace and prosperity in the new year that is about to begin.

[Begin Shevardnadze recording] I want to stress the significance of the dialogue that is being constantly maintained between the Soviet leadership and the leaders of Great Britain—specifically, the significance of the contacts, informal and very important, that have been established between Mrs Thatcher and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. Today we certainly did discuss a very wide range of issues. On many fundamental problems of the present day—both global problems and regional ones—there is a full, broad area of agreement. We also discussed our bilateral relations. There is satisfaction over the fact that they are developing dynamically and are following an ascending path. [end recording]

Unification Issue Aired at German SPD Congress

PM2012172589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[Own correspondent S. Zyubanov dispatch: "SPD Program Under Discussion"]

[Text] West Berlin, 18 Dec—The Social Democratic Party of Germany [SPD] Congress which opened here today is devoted to the adoption of a new program. It is to replace the 1959 Godesberg Program.

The draft document points out that the SPD is a "left-wing people's party" which advocates the democratization of a society built on the principles of "a social and ecological market economy." It seeks, as before, the creation of a United States of Europe. The party permits "German unity only within the framework of a united Europe of equal states."

In his speech of welcome to the congress Walter Momper, ruling mayor of West Berlin, emphasized that the SPD seeks a Europe in which there will be no more dividing borders, in which the economy and ecology will develop in harmony, and from which only peace will proceed.

Addressing the congress, SPD Chairman H.-J. Vogel declared: We do not want to go back once again to the national-socialist past. We want to move forward to a common European future.

After noting that reform processes of a truly revolutionary nature are taking place in East Europe, H.-J. Vogel pointed out that they are closely interconnected and would have been impossible without the policy of perestroyka being implemented in the USSR on Gorbachev's initiative. An important precondition for these changes was the policy of easing tension pursued by the Brandt and Schmidt governments in the seventies, and the treaties concluded by the FRG with the socialist states of East Europe. Without them the Helsinki process would have been impossible. In this connection the main speaker supported the idea of holding a new top-level all-European conference—Helsinki-2—and he proposed that it also touch on the "German question."

Then SPD Honorary Chairman Willy Brandt, whose 76th birthday fell on the day the congress opened, spoke. Everyone present warmly greeted the veteran of the Social Democratic Movement and chairman of the Socialist International.

The congress is continuing its work.

PRAVDA Reports on DKP Plenum Proceedings

PM2012192389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Dec 89 Second Edition p5

[TASS report: "German Communist Party Board Plenum"]

[Text] Bonn, 19 Dec—The newspaper UNSERE ZEIT has published documents from the German Communist Party [DKP] plenum held in Dusseldorf, at which the main attention was devoted to discussing questions connected with the situation in the party and the holding of its next congress.

Addressing the plenum, H. Mies, chairman of the DKP, said that socialist countries have now entered the stage of renewing society while struggling against antisocialist, counterrevolutionary, and nationalist forces. Imperialism, which has not given up its illusory hope of putting an end to socialism, is trying to exploit these processes in its own interests. Touching on the situation in the GDR, he pointed out that West German Communists are consistently in favor of its preservation as "a renewed state with a socialist economic and social system."

Socialism will continue to be the only alternative to the existing capitalist system, including in the FRG, the documents approved at the plenum stress. This makes it necessary to "preserve and renew the DKP as the revolutionary party of the working class." The documents indicate the importance of renewing the DKP on the basis of the theories of Marx, Engels, and Lenin and the need to overcome trends in favor of disbanding the party which have now appeared. At the same time, they state that the trends which have arisen in the party are "the inevitable consequence of the incompatibility of the majority and minority positions in the DKP."

By a majority vote, the plenum turned down the proposal that the Presidium and Secretariat of the DKP Board should resign.

It was decided to hold the party congress on 24-25 March 1990. This forum, Kh. Shter [name as transliterated], member of the DKP Board Presidium, said in his speech, is expected to answer the question of what direction the DKP's renewal should take. The attainment of socialism as a social system remains our aim.

French Defense Minister's Speech Criticized

90UI0202A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 12 Dec 89 p 3

[Andrey Balebanov comment: "Out of Step With the Times"]

[Text] French Defense Minister J.-P. Chevenement has called on West European countries for increased economic, political, and, what is most important, military cooperation. Addressing a session of the assembly of the Western European Union (WEU)—a military and political grouping incorporating Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Great Britain, France, Spain, Italy, Portugal, and the FRG—in Paris, the minister once again urged the preservation of France's strategy of "nuclear deterrence". He made it understood that France has no intention of revising its policy in the military sphere, at least until the Vienna negotiations produce effective results.

It is symbolic that the speech of the head of the French military department coincided with the third anniversary of the entry into force of the treaty on a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific, where Paris officials, ignoring the letter and spirit of this document and the protests of the indigenous inhabitants of the region, are continuing to carry out their nuclear tests on Mururoa atoll. This is testified to, if nothing else, by the latest (at the end of November), 110th, explosion since the start in 1975 of realization of the French program of underground nuclear tests in the Pacific. Perfecting weapons of mass destruction there, Paris is continuing to maintain here that the nuclear explosions are absolutely harmless. But if this is the case, why do the French not conduct them on Corsica, in Alsace, or in the Pyrenees?

Some commentators are, not without reason, viewing J.-P. Chevenement's statements through the prism of France's actions to strengthen its military ties to NATO, exercised in spite of the fact that Paris has not been a part of the bloc's military structure since 1966. These include France's regular participation in NATO's "war games," particularly close relations in the military sphere with the FRG and Great Britain, the recently disclosed instances of secret "nuclear relations" with the United States, the resolve to participate in the creation of a costly Atlantic air defense system, and so forth.

It was not fortuitous, I believe, that the French defense minister's call for the continued building of "defensive dams" in West Europe caused clear disenchantment even among the participants in the WEU Assembly session. Thus E. Baarveld- Shaman, the representative of the Netherlands, declared: "At a time when the cold war is receding into the past, I, as a socialist, was expecting different words of a French socialist minister, but heard the same old calls and the same excuse for France's adherence to nuclear weapons."

Apparently the winds of the new political thinking frequently bypass certain officials from the banks of the Seine.

Minister Katushev Signs Finnish Trade Protocol

LD1912130689 Helsinki Domestic Service in Finnish 1030 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Goods exchanged between Finland and the Soviet Union next year will remain at this year's level. According to the protocol on goods exchange for next year, signed today in Moscow, the value of Finnish exports to the Soviet Union next year will be about 13 billion markkas. Imports from the Soviet Union next year will be over R200 million greater than Finland's exports.

As the basis of the trade agreement, signed by Trade and Industry Minister Ilkka Suominen and Soviet Minister of Foreign Economic Relations Konstantin Katushev, a price for crude oil of $16.5 a barrel was made. The cautious price estimate is intended to make sure that no sudden change in oil prices upset the balance of trade. The foreign trade share in the goods exchange agreement is clearly growing, and the change in trade will mean that now several hundred suppliers will be negotiating, whereas there were only a few previously. The share of foreign trade, with the new protocol, is clearly growing, and next year will make up about a fifth of Finland's total exports to the Soviet Union, Minister Suominen said.

Sweden Says Wallenberg Search 'Must Continue'

PM1912165089 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 50. 10 Dec 89 p 2

["Exclusive" interview with Swedish Foreign Minister Sten Andersson by Helene Carlback: "A Dialogue Is Possible. Minister of Foreign Affairs of Sweden About the Wallenberg Case"]

[Text] "I emphasized more than once, including in a talk with the USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, that we think highly of the candidness displayed by the Soviet side in connection with a visit of relatives of Raoul Wallenberg to the Soviet Union. We also appreciate the Soviet side's preparedness to lend us a helping hand in the matter of establishing the authenticity of documents at our disposal. However, the position of the Swedish government remains the same: until a person's death is proved to be an established fact, the person may be considered living, and therefore the search for the person must continue."

That was the opinion of Sten Andersson Minister for Foreign Affairs of Sweden, which he told historian Helene Carlback who interviewed him on behalf of MN.

[Carlback] Does this mean that you do not consider the document shown to the relatives and the Swedish government sufficient proof of Raoul Wallenberg's death in July 1947?

[Andersson] Exactly. I didn't consider it necessary to check the authenticity of the documents. I mean the physician's report, because the authenticity of personal documents like the passport is unquestionable. Yet a physician's report is not adequate proof of a person's death. The Swedish government believes that this document cannot be ample proof of the fact of Wallenberg's death, because we are not sure about its authenticity. I think that the Soviet authorities also agree with this opinion. Were they of a different opinion, they wouldn't have been prepared to continue the search in the spirit of glasnost. Such a search would have been needless, had the USSR been sure that the fact of his death was sufficiently proved.

[Carlback] Relatives of Raoul Wallenberg and members of the Raoul Wallenberg society believe that now there is a possibility for a dialogue. Do you agree? In other words, is it worth looking for more documents?

[Andersson] Indeed, the relatives of Raoul Wallenberg have arrived at this conclusion, and now, after talking to them, I have no reason to think differently.

[Carlback] Did you discuss the development of scientific and cultural relations during your visit to Moscow?

[Andersson] The matter was discussed, but in fact that was not the main objective of my visit. We were primarily discussing foreign policy issues. However, I'm sure that the Soviet government is interested in the development of cultural ties between our two countries. Nevertheless, we discussed no concrete projects.

Latin America & Caribbean

Government Statement on U.S.'Attack' on Panama

LD2112104489 Moscow TASS in English 1041 GMT 21 Dec 89

["Soviet Statement on U.S. Attack on Panama"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow December 21 TASS—Follows the full text of the Soviet Government's statement:

The United States has committed an act of outright international arbitrariness. On the night of December 20 American troops launched a massive invasion into the territory of the sovereign Republic of Panama.

Used as a pretext for this intervention was the claim, repeatedly used in the past, that "the lives of Americans were threatened", and the notorious reference to "American interests".

Aviation, warships, tanks, artillery and airborne troops were moved against this little state. Blows were dealt at several districts of the Panamanian capital and human blood was spilt.

Washington's intervention against an independent state is a flagrant violation of the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter and norms of relations among states. The cynicism of this action consists in that it was allegedly taken "in defence of democracy" in Panama.

The armed U.S. action against Panama is a challenge to the international community which is striving to base its relations on principles of respect for the sovereignty and honour of other nations. It is in flagrant contradiction to the positive tendencies that are today gaining ground in world politics, and to dialogue and political-diplomatic methods of resolving difficult problems.

The American intervention was undertaken in defiance of the international community's repeated calls to display a balanced approach to the situation in Panama and contrary to the calls of Latin American states which urged Washington to unfailingly observe the principle of non-interference in Panamanian affairs.

The American action runs counter to the numerous efforts to achieve a political settlement in Central America. The security also of Soviet citizens is being endangered in Panama.

The Soviet Union urges the U.S. Administration to stop its intervention against sovereign Panama.

UN Envoy at Security Council Debate

LD2112120689 Moscow TASS in English 1106 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] New York December 21 TASS—The news of the United States invasion of Panama was met with alarm in the Soviet Union, Soviet Ambassador to the United Nations Aleksandr Belonogov told the U.N. Security Council on Wednesday.

No matter what justifications the United States present, this step is a gross violation of international practice accepted in the world and the United Nations Charter, and must be condemned by the international community, he said.

U.S. attempts to explain military action against a sovereign state with reference to Article 51 of the Charter and assertions that Panama posed a real threat to U.S. interests are baseless, he said.

They are no more convincing than if a cat would explain that she hunts a mouse to protect herself, Belonogov said.

The United States moved in to remove General Noriega. This has been a long-term overt U.S. objective, and the United States has been flexing its muscles in the past two years, resorting to threats, military and political pressure, economic blockade and other sanctions. The current Panamanian crisis did not happen overnight.

The Security Council's attention has repeatedly been drawn to alarming developments prompted by the U.S. policy in Panama in the letters of Panamanian representatives and at the Council sessions, the Soviet ambassador said.

Regrettably, the Security Council, for well-known reasons, took no steps to avert the current situation when the United States launched direct military intervention, he said.

"The Soviet Union does not maintain diplomatic relations with Panama. However, we cannot remain indifferent when fundamental issues of inter-state relations are questioned. We believe that the accepted U.N. principles of non-interference and non-use of force should be pursued wholly and without exception. These principles shall be strictly followed by all and in respect to all," he said.

"No matter what the attitudes to General Noriega's government are, the unwarranted introduction of foreign troops to the territory of a sovereign state and resulting bloodshed are unacceptable.

"Only the Panamanian people can and should choose for themselves.

"When confrontation is giving way to civilised relations between states, relapses into gunboat diplomacy are totally unacceptable.

"The role of a world policeman, no matter who assumes it, is a dangerous anachronism in the modern world," Belonogov said.

The Soviet Union believes that the United States should immediately stop its military intervention in Panama and withdraw its forces, he said.

"Any problems in U.S.-Panamanian relations should be tackled peacefully, through negotiations."

Further Reportage on U.S. 'Invasion' of Panama

U.S. Motives Examined

LD2012205389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Igor Fesunenko commentary; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Hello, comrades. The skies of Panama have again been lit up by fire and are wreathed in the smoke of explosions. Last night the United States began an armed invasion of that country. Participating in the intervention, which is taking place under the cover of the U.S. Air Force, in addition to the troops quartered in the former Panama Canal zone, are units of the U.S. 82nd Airborne Division, flown in from Fort Bragg in North Carolina, that is, the very same ones that, 6 years ago, mounted the invasion of Grenada. The main target of the operation is the general staff of Panama's national defence forces, and its main task is to capture General Manuel Antonio Noriega, the commander in chief of those forces.

Fierce fighting between the interventionists and subunits of the Panamanian national defense forces continued everywhere in the streets of the Panamanian capital today. As always happens in such cases, in the official statements made of by Washington spokesmen there was no shortage of self-justificatory arguments about protecting the lives of U.S. citizens and restoring democratic processes in Panama. The eloquence of official Washington seemed so keen that there appeared even the striking argument claiming that the aim of the operation was to ensure the best fulfillment of the treaties on the Panama Canal.

So history repeats itself. Once again, the world hears the last trump of gunboat diplomacy, well aware that Washington's anger has been roused not by concern for the fate of Americans in Panama, but by the desire to frustrate the implementation of the transfer of the canal to Panama by the year 2000, as was envisioned by the Carter-Torrijos treaties, and to preserve—this is probably the most important thing, to preserve at whatever cost—the U.S. complex of military bases on that country's territory. It is precisely for that reason that Washington has decided yet again on a flagrant violation of the basic tenets of international law. It is for that reason that blood is flowing and people are dying in the streets of Panama.

Parliamentarian Urges 'Proper Measures'

OW2112031589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1900 GMT 20 Dec 89

[From the "120 Minutes" program]

[Text] Aleksandr Dzasokhov, acting chairman of the Supreme Soviet Committee for International Affairs, met with journalists on 20 December.

Responding to questions from journalists concerning the invasion by U.S. troops of the territory of the sovereign state of Panama, he said in particular:

[Begin Dzasokhov recording] Perception of these events, in my opinion, also contrasts with the fact that the recent past has been marked by a considerable improvement in the political climate in the international arena. The concept of new political thinking professed not only by us, but shared by dozens of states in the international community, would seem to have opened prospects for making it less possible for action similar to that now taking place in Panama to occur.

Of course, we are interested in how the UN Security Council and the Central American states themselves react.

Against the background of these alarming reports, we favor the adoption of proper measures by the international community in order to eliminate the serious military and political tension which has arisen there as a result of the invasion by U.S. Armed Forces. [end recording]

U.S. Displays 'Imperial Thinking'

PM2012220189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[Gennadiy Zafesov "Observer's Opinion" under the general heading: "U.S. Armed Intervention"]

[Text] The bland diplomatic wording, hypocritical complaints, and provocative statements have been cast aside. The mighty United States of America has commenced aggression against tiny Panama, which is located on the isthmus linking the northern and southern parts of the Western Hemisphere.

The roar of military aircraft is to be heard over Panama, artillery shells are bursting, and the U.S. invasion forces and the Panamanian national defense forces are exchanging fire. People are dying. What many observers following the strained relations between the United States and Panama were predicting several months ago has begun. But, however realistic those assumptions were, you still did not want to believe them. The real changes which have occurred in international relations in recent years and the clearly warmer climate in relationships among states gave grounds for hoping that common sense would prevail and that the language of political dialogue would be preferred. Washington, however, has preferred an exchange of shots to an exchange of opinions.

And the blame for this lies, above all, with the United States. For, however the events are interpreted, it has become known that the U.S. President made the decision on a military invasion last Sunday. In other words, we are talking about a preplanned aggression. The smokescreen of propaganda backup for this action cannot conceal its essence. The talk of a need to "protect the lives of U.S. citizens" and to "restore the democratic process in Panama" is nothing more than camouflage behind which they want to hide the glaring fact of armed interference.

I will never believe that hostility toward General Noriega on the part of certain U.S. circles could have served as the grounds for interference. I believe that even the most credulous people will doubt that such a motive would be sufficient to mobilize several thousand U.S. servicemen armed with modern hardware. The attitude toward the Panamanian general is **merely the grounds, but in no way the motive.**

The following is the real reason: not to lose control over the Panama Canal, which links the Pacific and the Atlantic. You do not have to be a great military specialist to realize the canal's very great strategic value. The U.S.-Panamanian treaties provide for the canal to pass to Panama's full jurisdiction by the year 2000. By this same time it is proposed to eliminate the U.S. military bases on Panamanian territory. Including the ones from which aggression is being carried out against Panama today.

I am absolutely convinced that it was precisely the possibility of losing control over the isthmus that led to such a glaring U.S. action. It has thrust relations between Latin America and the United States back to the worst times of imperial thinking, which, as today's events show, is demonstrating very, very dangerous relapses.

The report of the invasion of Panama by U.S. troops has aroused a feeling of profound concern in the Soviet Union. As a USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said in his statement, these actions, being a violation of the UN Charter and of the generally accepted norms of interstate relations, are to be condemned by the world community. The United States must cease the armed intervention in Panama without delay.

TASS Reports 'Bounty' on Noriega

LD2112070589 Moscow TASS in English 0701 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Washington December 21 TASS—By TASS correspondent Igor Borisenko:

The White House has put a one million dollar bounty on the head of Panamanian General Manuel Antonio Noriega.

The statement was made late on Wednesday by Deputy White House Press Secretary Roman Popadiuk.

He said the United States will also pay 150 dollars for every rifle handed in by members of the Panamanian Defence Forces.

The apprehension of General Noriega also held on drug charges was one of the priorities of the U.S. attack on Panama.

Shortly before the White House announcement, spokesman Marlin Fitzwater circulated a written statement in which President Bush said he was satisfied at the progress of the U.S. military operation.

Important military objectives were reached, the operation went smoothly and all command levels maintained effective contact, the statement said.

The operation is being carried out according to a plan and all its aspects are continuing, it said.

TASS Describes Situation

LD2112101689 Moscow TASS in English 0736 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Panama December 21 TASS—By TASS correspondent Eldar Abdullayev:

The centre of the Panamanian captial was fully paralysed yesterday. No newspapers appeared, all offices, banks and shops were closed, and urban transport at a standstill.

The roar of artillery fire is still heard in the area of Mount Ancon. Helicopters and aircraft continue to fly over the Panamanian capital.

Heavy destruction was caused by shelling. Traces of fighting between U.S. troops and detachments of the Panamanian Armed Forces and volunteers from the "Dignidad" battalions can be seen—bloodstained pavements, spent cartridge cases, burnt cars and disabled tanks of the Panamanian National Defence Forces.

Ambulance and Red Cross cars are taking wounded people to hospital. The situation in the Central Hospital Santo Tomas is very serious. The hospital is filled to capacity, there is a shortage of medicines and blood. Medical personnel have no time to remove the dead.

Members of trade unions and public organisations are being mobilised to form a united resistance front.

News bulletins of the U.S. Southern Command are being regularly read on one of the television channels, and threats are being made to Panamanians who have not laid down their arms.

The government Radio National has urged all Panamanians to report American troop movements by telephone.

A session of the Panamanian Council of Ministers chaired by President Francisco Rodriguez continued through the day. Late on Wednesday Rodriguez held a press conference for local and foreign correspondents.

In the past few years, Panama has been a victim of economic, political and diplomatic aggression sponsored by the United States, he said.

The last page in this criminal war has now been turned with the armed intervention against Panama, the president said.

Despite great losses and considerable destruction, the government and the military command have launched resistance against the aggressors. The leadership of the country calls on the international public to demand that Washington immediately end this crazy war, he said.

This is not an action against one man—Noriega—as Washington insists. This is a wide-scale intervention against an entire people. Panama will continue to resolutely resist the aggression, he said.

This is a critical and crucial moment in Panama's history. The country's only "crime" is in trying to protect its sovereignty, honour and dignity, Rodriguez said.

The U.S. Air Force resumed bombardments in the Panamanian capital and the provinces on Wednesday night. Fierce clashes have been reported in the districts of Chorrera, Fort Amador and the Tocumen Road leading to the Omar Torrijos International airport.

Panamanian National Defence Forces are avoiding direct clashes with U.S. troops which now number 24,000. At the same time, the guerrilla movement is expected to become more and more active in cities and the countryside.

Two U.S. helicopters were shot down near Chorrillos and San Miguelito. About 15 American soldiers have been killed and about 60 wounded since the fighting began, according to the Panamanian side.

Despite using contemporary hardware, the U.S. troops are having trouble suppressing the Panamanian resistance.

The U.S. Southern Command has put a million dollar bounty on Noriega's head.

Americans overran a prison in the Gamboa suburb of the Panamanian capital and set free criminals and officers who took part in the recent revolt in Panama.

Additional U.S. troops—a motorised brigade of 10,000 to 12,000 men is unloading at the Omar Torrijos International Airport and at the Howard Air Force Base. The arrival of these reinforcements is expected to escalate combat operations.

After massive air strikes, American soldiers captured the main government radio station, Radio Nacional. Virtually all local radio stations have gone off the air. Only statements by the Southern Command and the Pentagon are being broadcast. According to the Southern Command, all tanks, armoured vehicles, aviation and artillery of the Panama Defence Forces (PDF) have been destroyed or captured.

Latest reports indicate that several hours ago the government, the PDF command, and the leadership of several political parties went into hiding. They are now trying to form a united front of resistance and to organise a guerrilla movement.

Baker Holds Special Briefing

LD2112102389 Moscow TASS in English 0953 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Washington December 21 TASS—United States Secretary of State James Baker briefed journalists at the State Department in an attempt to whitewash the U.S. invasion in Panama. The briefing was designed as a part of the broad U.S. propaganda campaign launched for this purpose.

Baker said that President Bush decided to send American troops into Panama on Sunday. He alleged that the action was taken "after receiving intelligence reports that Noriega was planning to attack Americans living in Panama City."

James Baker said that he could not guarantee the report's absolute trustworthiness." I am not going to tell you that the crisis in Panama has been totally resolved 13 hours into this operation," he said. "But Noriega, who was yesterday's maximum leader is today's haunted fugitive."

Congress of People's Deputies

Deputies Agree on Longer Sessions; To End 24 Dec

LD2112080889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0733 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, 21 Dec, (TASS)—A TASS parliamentary correspondent reports from the Kremlin:

The Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies is to continue for 2 days longer than originally scheduled and is to end on Sunday, 24 December. The participants decided this today. The deputies also agreed to extend the evening sessions until 2000 [1700 GMT].

These decisions were made at the suggestion of Mikhail Gorbachev, who, when he opened this morning's session, noted that the deputies had not managed to limit themselves to the order established at the opening of the Congress. There is a lag of about 1 and ½ days due to impassioned debates.

The following issues are still on the agenda: examination of the draft Law on Constitutional Supervision in the USSR and the election of a constitutional supervision committee; measures to strengthen the fight against organized crime; reports from the commissions formed at the previous Congress.

At this morning's session, participants in the Congress of USSR People's Deputies continued yesterday's discussion on a packet of draft laws to regulate the activity of deputies.

Further on 15 Dec Congressional Speeches

Turkmenistan's Niyazov

PM2012162189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Dec 89 Second Edition p 2

[Speech by Deputy S.A. Niyazov from Ashkhabadskiy Rural Territorial Electoral Okrug, Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic, (first secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee), at the 15 December evening session of the second Congress of USSR People's Deputies]

[Text] Esteemed people's deputies! The governments of all union republics, including ours, participated in the elaboration of measures for economic recovery. Of course, it was not possible to incorporate in these measures everything we would have liked to, and we had to proceed on the basis of today's realities. The 48 Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] deputies support what the country's government proposes for the economy's recovery at the present stage.

Out of the options proposed for the implementation of economic reform, the most acceptable and most promising—especially in our own republic's conditions—is the third one. While envisaging transition to market relations, it makes it possible not to deviate from the principles of social justice, to get rid of administrative influence, and to substantially boost the initiative of direct producers of material wealth. The planned package of measures will make it possible to ensure, within a relatively brief time period, the economy's monetary and financial recovery, the market's stabilization, and the solution of many social problems.

At the same time, some of the draft program's provisions require amplification and further working out.

What is meant by this? It follows from the draft that the enterprise is the main economic subject. In reality, however, its legal status fails to guarantee the complete transition to the new forms of economic management. We still have to organize the enterprise's normal functioning and primarily to eliminate losses by a number of enterprises. This is a paramount and most important task for our own republic. We have 131 money-losing enterprises. The draft program envisages that money-losing enterprises should cease being part of state property and already be leased out by early 1991. This measure gives rise to doubts. Is it likely to produce positive results unless the prevailing deformation in the price formation system is eliminated?

Therefore, in my view, a decision on the future of money-losing enterprises should be preceded by a reform of the price system. For this purpose, it is necessary to accept the government's proposal on retail prices: To amend the schedule for the implementation of comprehensive reform of the system of wholesale and purchase prices, embarking on its implementation in the second half of 1990 and completing it in 1991. The implementation of this proposal will make it possible to more swiftly establish a realistic system of evaluation in interrepublican and interregional mutual relations under conditions of regional economic accountability. If the old price system were to be retained until 1992, this would create serious difficulties with regard to the transition to new prices halfway through the 5-year plan period.

We also propose that the procedure for centrally established prices for basic raw material, fuel, and energy resources and the most important consumer goods be retained. At the same time, we propose that union republics' rights in price formation questions be expanded. What is meant is the right to autonomously establish and apply prices ensuring equivalence in the exchange of commodities between republics. I support the concept in Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov's report to the effect that administration will always be the function of owners. In the state enterprise the leader represents the state as the owner of the means of production. And he should be appointed, not elected. The experience of democratization in work with cadres in the republic made it possible to hold the elections of leaders on an alternative basis—from teamleader through to secretary of the Communist Party Central Committee and chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers. The elections of state enterprise leaders showed that group interests often appear here and are not always unselfish.

In addition, a sense of confidence and responsibility for discipline, order, and organization is not instilled in the leader.

I agree with the speakers who said that the success of the financial improvement of the economy depends largely on the taxation, credit, and price policy which forms the system of production incentives. The union republics' budget deficit can be reduced by the banks' payment of interest for the use of budget resources, which in Turkmenistan alone amount to around R225 million. Calculations show that setting a 5 percent interest rate will reduce our budget deficit by almost 15 percent. The financial improvement of the economy is largely determined by the correctness of the investment policy pursued. But the government report does not clarify the extent and scale of the privileges to be granted in the taxation of the construction of new enterprises for consumer goods production, the processing of agricultural produce, and so forth. In my opinion, the construction of such enterprises should be completely free of all taxes. The switch to the calculation of the formation of profit based on finished construction output should be part of a package with other measures to increase the efficiency of construction production and the restructuring of management, with the improvement of credit relations and planning estimates, and the creation of a market in construction output.

To meet the budget deficit it is also expedient to issue state loan bonds to enterprises, organizations, and cooperatives depending on the unattached resources at their disposal. While recognizing the need for and importance of having a special investment fund at the disposal of the USSR Council of Ministers, I would think it possible to create a similar fund for the Councils of Ministers of union republics, too. This would make it possible to promptly resolve urgent questions in those sectors in the republics which do not have enough resources of their own.

The most important and significant factor in improving the economic situation should be the effective tax regulation of financial mutual relations between the population and enterprises and the state. First and foremost there should be a uniform approach to all state, cooperative, and social enterprises which gives no one unjustified privileges either in terms of payments from profits and revenue or turnover tax.

To normalize money circulation in the Turkmen SSR, new ways to realize money incomes have begun to be employed: Such as the sale of state-owned homes and apartments to citizens. Lotteries are being held to promote saving, and individual goods which are not prime necessities are being sold by auction through the state retail trade network. The decision to give long leases on land attached to dachas enjoys particular support among the population.

I think that at the present stage it is necessary to substantially accelerate the process of changing the attitude to ownership. In this connection we propose abandoning state ownership in the sphere of consumer services and other types of services for the population, and applying the most progressive forms of economic accountability relations—the lease as well as cooperative and individual labor—on a wider scale.

It is very important to us that the government draft program presupposes the republics' transfer to self-management and self-financing in light of their initial development conditions. Particularly with regard to the living standard of the population of individual regions. Ignoring them in past years led to the aggravation of a number of contradictions and to a disproportion in the Turkmen SSR's socioeconomic development. In most indicators the living standard of the republic's population lags behind the average level of the union and other union republics and is among the lowest. At present over one-third of our families have a total average monthly per capita money income below R75.

The republic lags behind significantly in the provision of housing, pre-school institutions, schools, and health care facilities. The elimination of these disproportions is not feasible through the republic's resources alone. It needs subsidies from the union budget of at least R1 billion a year and to achieve the average union indicators for social development by the end of the 13th 5-year Plan will require subsidies of R2 billion to R2.5 billion a year.

The equalization of the initial conditions is not only conditioned by the need to implement measures to improve the economy but is also dictated by the conditions of the switch to regional economic accountability. We realize that this will require considerable central capital investments but that is fair and economically justified. In the past because of the bias toward raw materials we largely suffered losses. For example, can it be normal that over 90 percent of the cotton, wool, silk, and astrakhan produced in the republic is processed elsewhere and that this produces hardly any improvement in Turkmenistan's financial position?

Furthermore, the export of raw material produce from the republic within the all-union division of labor has complicated and aggravated the employment problem each year. At present only slightly more than 40 out of every 1,000 people in the republic are employed in industry, which is 3.5 times below the national average. Therefore, our right to compensation and economic support cannot be disputed. But we are not asking for a free handout. The investments in Turkmenistan's socioeconomic development have been calculated and enable it to increase its contribution to the all-union fund. And the reason for such confidence is our natural and economic potential and complete self-sufficiency in fuel, energy, and manpower.

The economic recovery program should pay special attention to the question of establishing regions which will receive validated state orders for output production. At present, as a rule, the degree of centralization of output produced under the state order issued to the republics, especially the Turkmen SSR, is extraordinarily high. This holds back the development of certain sectors of the republic's national economy, primarily sectors in the food complex. The measures proposed in the form of subsidies for food products will not reduce the urgency of the problem because in practice the volumes of food supplies are not linked to the volume set by the state order.

In brief, the proposed regional specializations will to a certain extent prevent the raising of the living standard of the population of a particular region. The mechanism for elaborating the structure and volumes of a region's state order essentially fails to take into account the level of consumption of consumer goods existing on their territory.

The validation of the volumes of the state order should be based on the principles of the equivalent exchange of output which take into account the unionwide specialization of the republics and the level of its population's supply with consumer goods [as published]. This can be achieved by introducing the equivalent exchange of output and consumer goods into the practice of the planning of long-term normatives. Here the union republics should be given the right to determine for themselves the structure and volumes of output supplied by them to other regions. Our deputies support the procedure planned for introduction on 1 January 1991 whereby, in addition to giving the union republics a state order for the main types of output, it also gives them an overall volume for those supplies expressed in cost price. If a union republic fails to meet its commitments it must compensate for the cost of the nondelivered output with resources taken from its own budget or make up the shortfall by agreeing with the customer to supply other food goods. The introduction of this provision is an important condition for improving the economic mechanism in the sphere of observing contractual commitments. The equivalent exchange of output must be based on the principles of equal economic benefit in the fulfillment of commitments within the framework of the all-union division of labor. The violation of this principle in the past meant that during 20 years of production the export of cotton from the republic increased by 2.5 times, while the food supply to us stayed at the old level. The republics should also be given the right to dispose of their above-plan output themselves, including the right to trade it abroad.

Comrades, the USSR government is offering us for the first time an integrated and effective package of economic recovery measures. But each of us asks the question: Are there any guarantees that they will be implemented or will they just remain on paper? I do not think that we will advance economic reform until we make the tenet that people are the true masters of our plants and factories a reality. Unfortunately, the working person today is unaware, as a rule, of where the national income which he generates is allocated and how this is done. For example, there are more than 30,000 oil and gas industry workers in Turkmenistan. Their labor accounts, in particular, for around 12 percent of all-union gas extraction. But they are all in complete ignorance as to the prices at which their output is sold and where the profit obtained is redistributed.

Such ignorance seriously undermines the sense of personal interest in the ultimate results of labor. And here I fully endorse Deputy Lavrov, who said that without such an interest it is going to be a long, hard struggle for us to implement the planned measures.

In conditions where society is undergoing politicization it is difficult for us, in particular, to explain to workers why Nebit-Dag and Krasnovodsk, major cities of oil and gas industry workers, have for a long time been unable to provide even normal drinking water, let alone create other social conditions for them. Such acute problems cannot be shirked today. Yes, there was the period of stagnation, when the social and consumer interests of individual regions were ignored. But now? The republic will energetically tackle these questions. This will have to be tackled by us.

But here I would like to talk about the role of union ministries. What are ministries and departments responsible for today when they exploit natural resources and site their enterprises in a particular region of the country? They are only responsible for the economic results of activity. But who will answer for the fact that this activity quite often poses a threat to the population's basic living conditions? This is already a political matter, but for the time being the responsibility for this is borne by the republics' leadership alone. I am sure that there is in the conditions of political and economic reforms under way a manifest urgent need not just for correct economic relations among republics and the center but for measures defining their responsibility for the political consequences of economic management.

Comrades, we support the measures proposed by the USSR government and request that our proposals and comments be taken into account during the reworking of the submitted draft.

Belov on Anti-Drink Campaigns

PM2012135589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Dec 89 Second Edition p 3

[Speech by Deputy V.I. Belov from the CPSU (secretary of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Writers' Union Board), at 15 December evening sitting of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies]

[Excerpts] Esteemed Congress Participants! I consider the laws on land, on the independence of local soviets, on the press and other mass media, and on freedom of conscience as the ones which brook absolutely no delay.

People are waiting impatiently for precisely these four laws. However, the USSR Supreme Soviet was either unable or unwilling to discuss them in earnest. If it was unable to discuss them, then I believe the Congress should not have been convened. It could have been postponed until the spring. If it was unwilling, then it is necessary to elect a new Supreme Soviet.

I do not know who decides the scale of legislative values or the order in which draft laws should be discussed. The USSR Supreme Soviet discussed for days on end the concerns of urban speculators, for instance, describing them as civilized cooperative members, while making no mention at all of peasant production cooperatives. We spent hours discussing questions pertaining to freedom of entry and exit, citizenship, and even pensions for emigres, while thousands of milkmaids and tractor drivers simply do not get a Soviet pension. So was it really necessary to have a public debate about future emigres' pensions? Would it not be better to remove the microphones and television cameras for such a debate, would it not be better to discuss this in secret, just as certain recommendations by scientific institutions and numerous government advisers are adopted in total secrecy?

You want examples? Here they are. Recommendations to the government on unpromising settlements, for instance, were drawn up in secret. No one outside a narrow departmental circle is familiar with the plan on concessions, or the nuclear power industry's plans.

I am not trying to say that the powers that be, having secured valuable support from the IAEA [International Atomic Energy Agency], have resumed the construction of nuclear projects all over the country. While our academicians are speaking about the growing shortage of electricity, the Americans, for instance, have stopped the construction of nuclear power stations and are concentrating on saving electricity and ensuring its thrifty consumption. We, on the other hand, instead of reducing the energy-intensiveness of production and saving every kilowatt-hour of electricity, are constructing more and more new power stations. It is also true that electricity exports are being planned in the corridors of the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification. With reference to the current economic program, I would like to ask: Why is it so persistently geared to Western technology? Have we no industry of our own? Are there not enough talented engineers and technicians here, or do we lack basic common sense?

Come on, Comrade Abalkin, we have all this here. You seem to have forgotten about our internal material and spiritual reserves. We are renouncing our own achievements in production, science, and technology. And meanwhile the mass media are concertedly inculcating an inferiority complex in our people. With strange satisfaction they claim that we are years behind, that without Western technology we are finished, that chaos is beginning in the country, and so forth.

Others are claiming that a "revolution from below" will start soon. I, for one, am fed up with all these revolutions, no matter whether they come from "below" or from "above." Let me remind you that man does not live by bread alone, and that not everything can be calculated in rubles and dollars. Let me recall the war when Russian peasants lived on potatoes alone. People are saying that they were enslaved. No, despite the fact that they were deceived at every step, they were great patriots. Can a patriot be a slave? Korotich and Yegor Yakovlev will tell you that he can, and I will tell you that he cannot. (Applause) [passage omitted]

A few words about drunkenness. I felt ashamed for our government when it recommended to the Supreme Soviet a budget containing 56 billion "liquor" rubles. In 1985 the government only took a timid step toward a sobriety campaign, but the champions of nationwide inebriation immediately raised a real rumpus in the press. The economist Shmelev has described me as part of the "moonshine mafia." It would be interesting to know to which mafia he belongs.

Esteemed Deputies! Take a look at the graphs depicting the crime rate in the country. The curve exactly matches our inconsistency regarding the sale of the drug of liquor, it matches our physical and spiritual degradation, the motor vehicle accident death rate, the domestic and industrial accident rate, the suicide and divorce rate, and moral degradation. All this is the product of those billions!

The new economists seek to justify the "drunken" billions by citing the budget deficit. Comrade Ministers, what would happen to the budget if millions of drunks woke up tomorrow and swore off drink forever, declared a strike, so to speak? The economist Shmelev will say that this will never happen. I, on the other hand, believe that it will. Basing the budget on "drunken" rubles is criminal and immoral. The "civilized drinkers" who have reached supreme power should take note of this.

I proposed at the second session that a most rigorous thrift campaign be introduced in the country. Thrift in everything and at all times. Not one of the deputies backed my proposal. Meanwhile we are squandering the people's billions almost as badly as during the times of so-called stagnation.

Take our foreign currency reserves, for instance. Aeroflot flights abroad are filled to capacity with various delegations and participants in international conferences, meetings, symposiums, cruises, and festivals. Travel in such large parties and with such frequency is unnecessary in my opinion. There are more than 1,000 ministries alone in the country as a whole. If each of them cut its staff by only 2-3 leaders, I have no idea how many millions or billions could be saved. Arithmetics is not my forte. [passage omitted]

Deputy Popov has called for a legalization of the rationing of essential goods. This marks the beginning of real shortages. Ration cards for bread and toothpaste.

It is well known that whoever holds bread in his hands holds the reins of power. Those who receive bread rations will no longer be interested in politics. They will have neither the time nor the desire for this. There can be no question of culture in such conditions. Incidentally, in the sphere of culture rationing was introduced long ago on television, radio, in the theaters, movie theaters, and in light entertainment. On the radio you rarely get to hear the voice of Lisitsian or Maksim Dormidontovich Mikhaylov, for instance, but Leontyev and Kashpirovskiy get the green light. The Tretyakov Gallery is closed, and to get to the Bolshoy, you have to be a people's deputy. KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA is propagandizing downright indecency—teaching our children how to copulate. Video and pornography have swamped our cities and villages. And all this on the pretext of perestroyka, glasnost, and democracy.

The Supreme Soviet is in no hurry to pass a law on censorship. Before we adopt such a law whole generations will go by, and not just our children, but also our grandchildren and great grandchildren will have been corrupted. [passage omitted]

In conclusion I must repeat the demands expressed most often in the thousands of letters and telegrams which I have received from voters and readers.

First, it is necessary without delay to elaborate and bestow state status on the RSFSR.

Second, it is necessary to rehabilitate the peasants who have suffered repressions and dekulakization in the twenties and thirties, and in the forties and fifties in the Baltic republics.

Third, it is necessary to create Russian mass media including television, cinematography, and theater. But not the kind of theater that Deputy Lavrov heads: For 4 years I have been trying to stage a play at a Leningrad theater, I have enlisted the help of five Politburo members, and all to no avail.

Fourth, it is necessary to return the orthodox churches and monasteries to their former owners—these are important demands and there are very many of them.

Fifth, it is necessary to restore the historical names of cities, streets, and squares. I emphasize, Comrades, this is not a request, it is a demand.

Gidaspov on Private Ownership

PM2012154389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Dec 89 First Edition p 1

["Our Correspondent" report: "No Easy Solutions"]

[Excerpt] Before yesterday's sitting began the Second Congress honored the memory of Academician Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov, outstanding scientist, public figure, and USSR people's deputy, who died suddenly on the evening of 14 December. We may have had different attitudes toward his opinions, Academician D.S. Likhachev said, we may have agreed or disagreed with him, but everyone will support me in saying that he was an extremely sincere man. His contribution to science and to strengthening the country's defense capability was certainly unique.

Then the 1,878 registered deputies continued the discussion of the government's proposed measures for the country's economic recovery. At last Thursday's section sittings, Chairman V.I. Vorotnikov reported, 112 deputies spoke. Some results of the section sittings were summed up yesterday.

Most of the speakers said that the decisions elaborated by the USSR Council of Ministers must be adopted with the additions and amendments voiced at the Congress. We must trust the government, Deputy N.N. Danilyuk said, give it all powers so that it can extricate our economy from the crisis over the next few years. Perestroyka will only progress if it becomes the personal concern of every Soviet person.

When discussing the problems of economic reform, some deputies also voiced the following idea: Rapid results can only be achieved by the introduction of private ownership. Is that where salvation lies? Deputy B.V. Gidaspov, first secretary of Leningrad Oblast CPSU Committee and City CPSU Committee, expressed an interesting viewpoint during a conversation with us.

"Certainly, people are saying that conditions are ripe for private ownership. I can answer that if the conditions are indeed ripe, then fine. But here are the facts. There are a total of 28 individual farms in the oblast. No one wants any more. So what are we discussing? If 1 million peasants come to me and say: We want to buy land, then there is something to discuss. But when we have only persuaded 28 families, that is not the norm yet. Consequently, different approaches are needed here." [Passage omitted].

Deputy Criticizes Idea of Regional Autonomy 16 Dec

PM2012141589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Dec 89 Second Edition p 3

[Speech by Deputy N.I. Kondratenko from Tikhoretskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Krasnodar Kray (chairman of Krasnodar Krayispolkom), at 16 December morning sitting of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies]

[Text] I have finally mounted this high platform.

Esteemed comrade deputies! Our people have a truly golden rule regarding the country's political leaders and also such bodies as our congress: Judge everyone by their deeds and reward them accordingly. Admittedly, this is traditionally a delayed process, but is it not time to evaluate—however risky, serious, and hard this may be—the phenomena and processes taking place in our society in a timely fashion in accordance with the principles of perestroyka? The current state of the country demands this of everyone regardless of their creed.

I recall how hope and faith were in the air after April 1985, and how people's faces shone with delight as they wholeheartedly and completely accepted perestroyka and enthusiastically embarked on renewing life and cleansing socialism of its deformations and mistakes. Now, almost 5 years later, with ever-increasing frequency one hears words of protest not only from leaders, but also from ordinary workers. People are tired of promises and debate; they are confused, irritated, and angry. They refuse to tolerate what is happening in the country. After all a good policy is one that produces a change for the better by the second or even the third year. A policy that promises heaven on earth cannot be justified and a deterioration in the people's standard of living is quite inadmissible. For the current generation is also entitled to happiness. The empty shelves in the stores, the shameful ration coupons, unprecedented inflation, mad price rises, tens of thousands of refugees and even corpses, the strikes and stoppages which have already become common practice, along with the hundreds of railroad cars idling in station sidings, and an unprecedented upsurge in crime in its most awful forms moreover—corruption, racketeering, and mafia-like manifestations—all these have become common currency today.

If today we encounter among the working masses a lack of comprehension and a refusal to accept the changes that are taking place, it is clear that we must conduct an in-depth analysis of the source and roots of these phenomena, find the reasons for them, and make reasonable amendments to our policy without changing course as a whole. Rather than destroying or forcing the upsurge in the people's spirits brought about by the processes of democratization into a procrustean bed of ideas and schemes imposed from all sides, rather than seeking out anti-perestroyka conservatives or extremists and pretending that everything is going as planned.

There is today no shortage of talk and words, no shortage of pluralism of opinion. There are other shortages, the main one being the shortage of action. In order to divert the masses onto the path of creating material and spiritual blessings that accord with their fundamental interests, the path of discipline and responsibility in society, we must abandon phrasemongering and political adventurism, stop periodically palming theoretical "deadwood" off on the people, and, to use a Russian expression, simply not stir up the waters with a view to catching our own fish in them. At present the ugly process of society's stratification and decomposition is under way in all areas: In the economy, in the social and spiritual spheres, and in interethnic relations. You don't need a great mind to realize why in this smoky atmosphere of noisy skirmishes people are yelling slogans about a return to private ownership, the removal of V.I. Lenin's body from the Mausoleum, the abolition of the national anthem and compulsory military service, the elimination of the state security organs, the abandonment of collective farms, and the idea that Great October is a historical mistake, and so on.

You sometimes think how deeply socialism and the belief in it—even taking past mistakes and miscalculations into consideration—are entrenched in people's minds. Despite the fact that over the last few years socialism's enemies and their stooges, disguised, unfortunately, by their party membership cards, have waged a frenzied attack on the party, on everything it has gained over the years and built at the cost of great effort; the people have not snatched the "bait" offered by the capitalist paradise or its much-vaunted, most humane, common human values.

Nor can I agree with the so-called leading lights of our economic thought who have permeated all the mass media, barring the way to different opinions on ways to salvage our economy. It is quite clear that many of them are not trying to competently adapt market relations to our present-day economy but are trying to launch the country on a capitalist development path. Moreover, a backdrop of hatred for socialism has also been created artificially via shortages of meat, sugar, socks, school primers, and medicines. Yet these commodities have been present in our stores since 1949, albeit not in the best packaging or the best range. How was it that the hungry people who were able to organize the production of tanks, "Katyushas," and ground-attack aircraft in the back of beyond found themselves unable to have a wash? That can only happen artificially. Or, excuse me, under an unsatisfactory leadership. The whole difference is only that Comrade Popov suspects my team, say, of subversive activity, yet I have spent two years working as chairman of the kray soviet executive committee [kray-ispolkom], while in this case my team, observing merely the ethics of comradeship, does not accuse Gavriil Kharitonovich and his comrades-in-arms of this. There is no need to be surprised, for we can all see that these comrades-in-arms can be found in political, state, and government structures.

Let us ask some questions: If my position is insecure and my job is in jeopardy, and elections to local soviets are under way, why would I set public opinion against myself and create shortages? My election prospects may be destroyed by an artificially created shortage. We soviet workers exchanged opinions after the speech delivered by Gavriil Kharitonovich, for whom I have great respect, and decided that if a man like him said this, then there will be shortages.

Some of our scientists have produced an academic haze, while political specialists have transformed the question of ownership, which anyone who is at all familiar with the rudiments of political economy can understand, into a mysterious phenomenon. It is reasonable to ask them the following question: Why, comrades, do you not want to consider Marx' conclusions regarding the dual nature of public ownership, that is, the public nature of ownership and individual-collective use? After all, the existence of public property still does not guarantee that it will multiply and be fairly distributed according to labor. The appropriate management and economic mechanisms are necessary for this. But, strange as this may seem, our economists have been incapable of doing this, although the people paid them well throughout this period. They are proposing to change the forms of property ownership instead of solving the question of use of property.

Who cannot understand that when a proprietor has acquired a small amount of money through incredible effort based on private ownership, he will be unable and even unwilling to increase it without hired labor. In our kray we have already encountered the situation where ruthless exploitation of people who have fallen into this "trap" is flourishing in the guise of the cooperative. So where, comrade academicians, is the mechanism that will protect ordinary people from the diktat of the Soviet neobourgeoisie? We must not, comrades, harbor any illusions—the latter will still be harsh, ruthless, uncivilized, and prepared to sell their own grandmother without batting an eyelid.

PRAVDA recently wrote about how a cooperative worker went too far and severely beat up a municipal newspaper correspondent for attempting to criticize and denounce him. When we discuss the crime question I can explain everything about this case. But nevertheless, after they began to investigate —let us be blunt about it—flagrant breaches of financial discipline, a krayispolkom secretary, an honest man devoted to the cause, was severely beaten up. Before coming here, an ispolkom official came to me, trembling, and asked to resign—his wife had received a letter bearing the following message: "Esteemed Sir, why are you poking your nose into other people's business? Remember something bad may happen to your family—your children, your wife, and, lastly, yourself. There are very many ways and means of doing this. Hold your horses, put the brakes on, and think before it's too late. We wish you success in your main work." So I would like to say: We Bolsheviks are not made of putty for every reverse to bring us to our knees!

Without claiming to be the repository of utter truth, I want to voice my opinion of the idea of regional economic accountability [khozraschet]. In itself it is an alluring idea, and the Kuban is prepared to work under the new conditions. But in the current situation of universal shortages transferring regions and republics to khozraschet by the willful means of fixed prices and disorganized price formation is equivalent to anticipating things and attempting to present wishes as reality. Khozraschet at regional level now constitutes a lever to split our state and, if you like, multiethnic union. How can it be imposed from above when economically accountable relations have not been fully perfected at enterprise level? Khozraschet is, after all, not something that is written down on paper even if it is described as a law, but something that goes through a person's mind every minute, impelling them to work. I hardly believe that every inhabitant is quivering every minute with the realization that something is not going well with production somewhere in the kray. That is what happens with real khozraschet—only at enterprise level. While at kray, oblast, and republic level, this is a farfetched model. It cannot give rise to anything but nationalism and truculent localist tendencies in the distributive processes. Especially, I repeat, given our shortages. It will not be the Kuban that is the first to suffer but, as in the well-known olden days, the children of the Volga region, the arid Kalmyk Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic and Central Asia, the dry North, and the unfortunate Non-Chernozem Region. We are in already in the grip of localist tendencies and anarchy today in questions of material supplies and deliveries as a whole.

I have studied many models and concepts of regional khozraschet and could not help noticing that their authors base their thoughts on the principle of "selling your own produce at a higher price—naturally leaving the best for yourself—and buying someone else's produce more cheaply." Everyone is convinced that he will be able to perform this stunt in practice. This model seems, for instance, to have been set up in Estonia with the help of Supreme Soviet members. The republic itself now earns less than one-third of the hard currency it uses and obtains the rest from the country's budget. Intraunion prices for its industrial goods exceed world prices by a factor of 7-10, while it obtains fuel and energy raw materials at prices which are lower than world prices by a factor of 3-5. Unlike our kray and Russia as a whole, Estonia's budget receives all the income tax and virtually all the turnover tax. Enterprises under union jurisdiction also make an extremely significant contribution. Moreover, as of the new year, that is with the introduction of the new model, this contribution will increase still further. In 1988 R851 of budgetary funds were spent per one inhabitant in Russia, while this figure was R1,268 in Estonia. You may think that Russia is the best provided for in terms of amenities. I am sure that in terms of its destructive force the implementation of the ideas of regional khozraschet in—I repeat—current conditions will inflict a blow a hundred times more devastating than academicians' scientific recommendations regarding the elimination of unpromising villages which have been taken on board by hapless politicians.

I am firmly convinced that we must concentrate on living an effective khozraschet—at enterprise level. I am referring to both the lease and share options—only at our own enterprises, not at anyone else's—in order to increase people's sense of ownership. I believe we must concentrate on this work.

But once again, comrades, it is price reform that is necessary. For the transition to self-recoupment without price reform has already given rise to considerable troubles. We have failed to notice that one-third of industrial group consumer goods are unprofitable. These include children's clothes, footwear, spade handles, household buckets, rings for peasant stoves, and 60 percent of canned output. The list can go on ad infinitum. All these are taken out of production with the transition to self-recoupment. Who will produce output at a loss, according to the laws of this "sacred" market? People are seeking the "wreckers," the "enemies of perestroyka," the ones who have done this.

Here is another example. I particularly want to address the government here. I am afraid that an unprecedented explosion awaits us in connection with the food problem. Production of meat, particularly pork, mutton, and beef, is unprofitable in the kray. Now that we have abandoned edicts and stopped monitoring minimum head counts, this has resulted in a sharp cutback. Comrades, disaster awaits us here. Without doubt, steps must be taken. Otherwise we will pay a very hard price. Either we need a sackful of money to lure economic managers like hens into a henhouse, or they will have to be authorized to issue edicts just once more at least.

It is particularly offensive, comrades, when you spend 365 days a year day and night hunting out scraps of meat for Moscow. We are depriving ourselves, depriving Chelyabinsk—and supplying Moscow first. Finding meat is no easy task in a "troubled" market. You go to work in the morning with the knowledge that you have been "slammed" as a bureaucratic parasite and spend the whole day laboring under the effects of this "endearment."

Comrades, if you will allow me another two minutes. We must work in disciplined conditions, I am sure we will return to this. Thank you for your attention.

Deputies Comment on Discipline Problems

PM2012152189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[Commentary by parliamentary observer Miroslav Buzhkevich under the rubric "Congress: Day by Day": "Shortage of... Discipline"]

[Text] The feasibility of the proposed large social transformations depends directly on the ability of us, together and individually, to work economically, sensibly, and effectively and imbue society with a mood for creativity. In other words it is a case of the degree of organization and discipline in all its forms: state, manufacturing, and labor discipline.

I. Glazunov, director of the Anzob mining and enrichment combine (Leninabad Oblast) greatly regretted being unable to speak during the debates on the government economic program. He wanted to speak about an alarming phenomenon—the decline in production and contract discipline. Suppliers do not fulfill their commitments and disrupt the dispatch of equipment. And he has his own difficulties. For instance, take the appointment by election of enterprise, shop, and sector leaders. Many people believe that this venture, promoted to the rank of a democratic obligation, often brings not benefit but the exact opposite. People of weak character who flirt with their subordinates end up as leaders. And discipline declines and the cause is harmed.

Discipline is directly linked with the adjustment of production technology. That is the opinion of Deputy S. Kandaurov, a welder at the Kursk "Elektroagregat" association. The worker realizes that every lost minute is reflected in his wages. It can be different: A man comes into the shop, has a talk, and spends half his shift in the smoking room. Yet he is payed in full for his working day—there is such disorder in organizing labor. Who in that case will work flat out?

Strikes are a painful topic. At the Congress I did not meet a single person who approved of them. N. Gobanu, chief editor of the weekly LITERATURA SHI ARTA, without beating about the bush said that the strikes in Moldavia have hurt the pocket of the working man and the country. That is not the way to resolve economic and social problems. Other deputies also answered my question about strikes in the same way. A characteristic detail: The first wave of miners' strikes generated approval in many people. The miners were viewed as the heroes of the day. But their repeated demonstrations caused the opposite reaction.

Deputy I. Sumarokov, director of the "Usolye" agricultural combine (Irkutsk Oblast) asked me a rhetorical question: "But do the peasants not have acute problems?" And he answered himself: "Yes, no fewer than the miners." But in the countryside they do not think of striking: Who would feed the country?"

One of my interlocutors compared the strike with a powerful medicine given in exceptional cases. Thus in the economy resorting to a strike is permissible only in extreme circumstances. And it is better to do without strikes. Here, of course, much depends on the economic leaders, trade union and party workers, and leaders of state organs. A strike which has flared up is a signal that they are not properly concerned about improving the working man's work and living conditions.

There are many examples of party and trade union committees influencing events and the situation in the labor collectives. Deputy L. Suprunov, chairman of the Maritime Kray committee of the trade union of motor transport and highway workers, recalled how at the beginning of the year the situation became heated in some of the bus depots in Vladivostok: The drivers, dissatisfied with their working and daily living conditions, were prepared to start a strike. The trade union activists together with the workers investigated each of their demands, supported the just demands, and sought to have them examined. And the strike did not take place. Had this not happened, L. Suprunov concluded, the workers and the enterprises would have lost a lot. And in our kray more than enough of the people's wealth is perishing beneath our feet. Take the roads: We blow up and ruin vehicles on them and burn up gasoline.

Yes, we still have enough thriftlessness and the vain expenditure of funds and forces. And this is the logical continuation of lack of organization, poor discipline and responsibility, and the direct violation of laws. So what are we complaining about? We live as we work!

I remember the second session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. During the discussion of the country's budget for 1990 it emerged that there was slightly less than R2.5 billion missing to resolve an important social task. I do not know how the financial experts succeeded in closing this breach. They would probably not have had to dodge that much if discipline had strengthened in the production sphere, if all channels were closed to losses of raw material and equipment and the wasting of work time because of absenteeism caused by drunkenness. If only...

Academician Zh. Alferov spoke in a figurative and profound way at the Congress: No one will build us "turnkey" socialism. Yes, we must do this ourselves. And the program of economic renewal which the Congress will assert will be an important step here.

18 Dec Congressional Speeches Reported

Nishanov Report

PM2012171189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Dec 89 Second Edition p 2

[Report by R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, at the 18 December session of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies: "On Draft Legislative Acts Defining the Status of People's Deputies in the USSR and Other Questions Associated With Deputies' Activity"]

[Text] Esteemed comrade deputies!

In compliance with instructions by the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet submits for your consideration a draft USSR Law "On the Status of People's Deputies in the USSR" and other draft laws referring to deputies' activity.

As you know, following the debate on the agenda of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the congress resolved to examine not only the draft USSR Law on the Status of People's Deputies in the USSR and other questions associated with deputies' activity, but also the draft legislative act defining the status of USSR people's deputies.

It was only to be expected that many deputies displayed the utmost activeness over the draft USSR Law on the Status of USSR People's Deputies. Numerous individual and group proposals were received on this question. All of them without exception were examined by the Supreme Soviet's working groups, committees, and commissions. Two alternative drafts of this act were produced at the very final stage. One of them was prepared by People's Deputies Levykin, Lubenchenko, and Sebentsov and was supported by 12 other people's deputies including Ryzhov, Boldyrev, Yevtushenko, Kurtashin, Kazannik, Filshin, and Yablokov. This draft was recommended for consideration by the committees. Following additional work on it, the congress could instruct the USSR Supreme Soviet to adopt it in the very near future.

The other draft on this selfsame question was submitted by USSR People's Deputy Obolenskiy. In the opinion of the Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order Committee and the Soviet of People's Deputies and Management and Self-Management Development Committee, it needs some very serious additional work and was not deemed ready to be discussed.

It was pointed out at the joint session of the aforementioned committees, specifically by People's Deputies Khmura, Travkin, and others, that a whole series of the draft's provisions wittingly or unwittingly lead to the shaping of a new administrative-edict system, this time made up of USSR people's deputies, and to the creation of conditions for unjustified interference in the activity of various organs. For example, it is proposed to give USSR people's deputies the power to suspend directives and orders by officials whenever they run contrary to the law, with the officials' immediate performance of deputies' written injunctions, and even the right to attend the interrogation of accused persons at any stage of the investigation and to express their own opinion.

Some of the draft's provisions are aimed at creating conditions for a special and privileged status for USSR people's deputies, which would be unacceptable in the conditions of our social life's perestroyka.

Nonetheless, a series of sensible provisions in Deputy Obolenskiy's draft could be considered and utilized when doing additional work on the USSR Law on the Status of USSR People's Deputies.

I would like to dwell in more detail on the basic provisions of the draft legislative acts defining the status of USSR people's deputies and on other issues relating to the activity of deputies.

First and foremost I would like to note that the need for a single law defining the status of USSR people's deputies on whose basis sovereign republics would be able also to adopt republic laws, if they deem this possible, on people's deputies of soviets of different levels flows primarily from the unity of the system of soviets in our country. The fact that in his practical work a deputy acts in an interrelationship with officials and organizations subordinate to the most diverse authorities—local, republic, and union—also requires legislative regulation of the activity of all deputies. For this reason, the relationship of deputies with all officials and organizations should and could be defined only by a USSR law.

Nor must we disregard the fact that the activity of deputies involves issues that have to be resolved in the same manner in each union republic (for example, questions of the protection of the labor rights of deputies, their immunity, their material and financial provision, and so forth).

Finally, it is hardly possible to permit the powers of deputies to differ in principle in various union republics.

All the aforementioned provisions enable us to regard it as necessary that the principles of the upkeep of the organization and activity [printsipy soderzhaniya organizatsii i deyatelnosti] of a people's deputy should be defined in a single USSR Law on the Status of USSR People's Deputies.

A people's deputy today is the main figure in the soviets of people's deputies. It is very important to fully and accurately define in law the status of deputies, and their rights and duties in their relations with soviets, voters, state and public organizations, and officials. The drafts submitted aim to resolve these tasks. In elaborating them the USSR Supreme Soviet proceeded from Lenin's ideas on the soviets as organs of genuine people's power.

Comrade deputies!

The days when deputies, formally surrounded by honors and respect, were in fact merely a ceremonial facade of the administrative-edict system have receded into the past.

In the course of the revolutionary renewal of our society begun in April 1985 we are ridding ourselves of the burdensome legacy of the past and the deformations in the system of power, and we can say that soviet deputies today have moved from the fringes of the political process to the forefront of contemporary political life.

At the same time, there has been a sharp rise in the demands made by voters and by the whole of society on deputies and on the soviets as a whole, on the effectiveness of their decisions. Deputies must become genuinely plenipotentiary and responsible representatives of the people, and this is laid down by the law's norms.

A deputy's status includes both rights and duties, both powers and responsibilities, and, of course, guarantees of a deputy's activity.

The initial version of the draft "Law on the Status of People's Deputies in the USSR," prepared by scientific workers of Moscow State University's Institute of Soviet State Building and Legislation and by specialists on the basis of the generalized proposals of the people's deputies was distributed to us all. It was discussed in all committees and permanent commissions of the chambers. The draft has twice been discussed by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

As a result of this serious work done directly in the USSR Supreme Soviet, the draft law has been noticeably improved. Many amendments, additions, amplifications, and editorial corrections have been incorporated. The draft now offered to you is, so to speak, the foundation of legislation in this sphere and establishes the fundamental democratic principles of deputies' activity and its most important guarantees.

While preparing it we proceeded from the premise that each deputy's enterprising participation in the exercise of soviet powers is an absolute condition for restoring the full power of the soviets.

The draft which has been submitted reflects the common elements of the status of deputies to soviets at all levels. Of course, the specific features of the status of USSR people's deputies will be defined on the basis of the general Law on the Status of People's Deputies in the USSR and with due consideration for the provisions of the Standing Orders of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet and other laws defining the activity of USSR people's deputies.

I would like to stress once more that the status of people's deputies of union and autonomous republics and local soviets can be developed by the republics themselves on the basis of the USSR Constitution and of union republic constitutions within the framework of the general principles established by the union Law on the Status of Deputies in the USSR.

The draft maintains continuity with the current USSR Law on the Status of People's Deputies in the USSR and includes tried and tested norms for deputies' activity which have proved their worth. At the same time, it is necessary to emphasize that the status of people's deputies has been considerably enriched, reflecting the new practice and the demands of the time.

The draft's preamble and the "General Provisions" section offer a modern description of sociopolitical and legislative fundamentals, in other words the main guidelines of deputies' activity. It also specifies the priorities of interests by which deputies must be guided. These are primarily the interests of the people. A deputy must express and uphold the voters' interests, obey their mandates, and not simply bear their requests in mind.

A deputy must proceed from consideration for the economic, cultural, national, and other specific features of the union republic, autonomous unit, or administrative-territorial formation in whose territory deputies exercise their powers.

The draft consistently pursues the principle of full equality between deputies of soviets at all levels, as well as the demand—which is only natural in a rule-of-law state—to build deputies' work in conformity with the laws.

There is also confirmation of the constitutional principle of combining deputies' activity with the fulfillment of production and official commitments (Article 4). As regards the proposal to fully or partially release deputies to all soviets—from supreme to local—from their main jobs and to transform all deputies into "professionals," this runs contrary to the very nature of soviets as "working corporations," and to the development of self-management principles within them. At the same time, however, this does not rule out the possibility that a proportion of deputies might focus entirely on work in the Supreme Soviet, taking into account the scope and volume of its activity.

Another of the draft's specific features is the fact that it is aimed at developing the initiative and activeness of deputies, at ensuring broad opportunities for free expression of opinions during the discussion and solution of questions in a soviet, and at displaying full autonomy in deputies' activity.

The draft enshrines a broad range of deputies' rights which were absent from the previous law. For example, the deputy's right to raise questions of confidence in the composition of organs formed or elected by the soviet, or in officials.

But even the rights in soviets which were formerly vested in deputies are stated in greater detail in the draft. For example, the article on deputies' questions is supplemented by a series of new provisions. There is a definition of deputies' questions, and the range of organs to which they may be addressed has been expanded. It is envisaged that questions, replies to them, and decisions made by soviets following an examination of the questions must be published. The norm establishing a soviet's right to hold a state organ or official accountable on a given question serves as a warning against formal attitudes toward the fulfillment of such decisions.

New rights have also been established enabling every deputy to display autonomy, initiative, and activeness in a soviet and its organs. But does this mean that a deputy can be absolutely independent in his activity? Of course not. A deputy's entire activity must above all be subordinated to the will and mandates of voters which a soviet has taken on for implementation.

Obviously, nobody doubts the fact that there must be no barriers to each deputy's free expression of his electorate's will or of social interests for legitimate actions in this area.

A deputy is entitled to act as a representative of state power (Article 25). But people who at times try to present deputies as some sort of overlords capable of issuing orders in all directions and acting as leaders of inferior soviets are incorrect. Deputies are members of a collegial representative organ of power. Many of the powers vested in deputies in the sphere of lawmaking, administration, and monitoring are exercised by them collectively in the interests of all voters falling under the relevant soviet.

In this joint activity every deputy not only exercises his powers but also bears responsibility to the soviet and is called on to perform the instructions of the soviet and its organs, to observe the established procedures for the representative organ's work and the demands of deputies' ethics. This has to be said again because we have already and repeatedly come up against improper behavior by some deputies and crude attacks on various comrades.

A soviet is empowered to hear a deputy's report on his work in the soviet and the fulfillment of decisions and instructions by the soviet and its organs.

You know how great is the volume of deputies' affairs in their electoral okrugs or the public organizations from which they have been elected. The section devoted to this question enshrines a package of rights and obligations.

The draft also enshrines the deputy's right to invite officials of state and public organs and organizations to participate in the reception of citizens. They are obliged to send their representatives to take part in the reception.

Deputies are endowed with the right to investigate on their own initiative—if necessary by involving the public and people's controllers—instances that have come to their knowledge of violations of legality, or of the rights and interests of citizens or organizations, and manifestations of red tape and bureaucratism, to obtain the information needed to do this, and to demand the elimination of the violations from the appropriate organs and officials.

There are still officials who do not fulfill their obligations to deputies or obstruct the effective exercise of their powers, sometimes presenting them with knowingly false information, and at other times even breaching the guarantees regarding deputies' activity. I draw your attention to a new provision in Article 7: In such cases, officials are subject to disciplinary liability up to and including dismissal from office, or to administrative or criminal accountability in accordance with the law.

The draft enshrines the rights of deputies to take part and have a consultative voice in sessions of inferior soviets and their organs, and to unite in deputies' groups for joint work in electoral okrugs and labor collectives.

I would like to draw your attention to the need to establish law-based mutual relations between deputies of different soviets. Proposals have been voiced to the effect that USSR people's deputies should be endowed with the right to convene extraordinary sessions of local soviets in their own electoral okrugs, the right to a deciding vote in all inferior soviets, the right of "veto" over decisions by republic organs of power and local soviets, the right of a "delaying veto" over decisions of economic, executive, and administrative organs in their own electoral okrugs, and so on.

But all this is incompatible with the principle of the sovereignty of soviets on their own territory and, for this reason, such proposals cannot be supported.

Speaking of the obligations of people's deputies who are members of the USSR Supreme Soviet, I would like to emphasize the importance of their active work during Supreme Soviet sessions. For example, 371 deputies spoke during the Supreme Soviet's second session alone. Deputies introduced 218 proposals and remarks.

In parallel with the positive trends in the Supreme Soviet's activity, a certain worry is caused by the growing number of deputies who do not attend Supreme Soviet sessions: 120 persons were regularly absent from plenary sessions. At one of its second session sittings the Supreme Soviet was unable to make a decision because no quorum was present.

It must be said that over 70 deputies failed to attend almost one-half of the sessions, while some of them even failed to notify the causes of their absence.

I am thus forced to note that approximately one-third of members of committees and commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers do not attend their sessions.

Comrades deputies! I would like to touch upon one more issue.

You are aware that the Supreme Soviet maintains broad contacts with foreign parliaments. This is a very necessary avenue of our parliament's work.

In the period between the first and second congresses over 20 delegations and groups of USSR people's deputies traveled abroad on official missions. At the same time, we ought to point out the absence of proper order in this matter. A certain section of deputies has been traveling abroad on private invitations and invitations from various foreign organizations even while the USSR Supreme Soviet has been in session. Furthermore, certain deputies did not even inform the heads of the chamber committees and commissions of their trips. I would like to point out that in many countries trips by parliamentarians abroad during the period of a parliamentary session are not the general practice. The situation developing in our country is abnormal. It is necessary to regularize the whole system of foreign trips by USSR people's deputies.

Allow me to draw your attention to another matter. In the conditions of broad glasnost in the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet and people's deputies, special importance is attached to the use of the mass media.

The way things stand now, only a small circle of people's deputies make statements in the press and on radio and television. Our voters and the public have noticed this. I think that a broader circle of people's deputies should make use of the mass media.

We have before us an application by People's Deputy Kiselev from Kamchatka Oblast, complaining that the oblast newspaper offers him no opportunity to make statements. Local mass media are also bound, in compliance with the laws, to satisfy the demands by USSR people's deputies.

Comrades! The draft has further developed the provisions regarding deputies' accountability to voters, and regarding voters' mandates. The procedure for conducting report-back meetings has been rendered more precise and specific, more fully reflecting the glasnost principle. But the most substantial changes concern the provisions regarding voters' mandates.

In accordance with proposals by many deputies a new section on "Organization of Work With Voters' and Public Organizations' Mandates" has been included in the draft law. Originally, as you know, it was intended to adopt a separate law on mandates. However, during the course of all-around discussion of the numerous versions of the draft law in committees and commissions, in working groups, and at Supreme Soviet sessions it was deemed expedient to include the main provisions on mandates in the draft USSR Law on the Status of People's Deputies. This has been done.

The proposed section on mandates contains five articles. They provide a definition of mandates and lay down the general principles for the procedure for their consideration and implementation, the participation of deputies in work with mandates, and the guaranteeing of glasnost.

We cannot overlook the fact that mandates have already been issued in the course of the campaign for the election of USSR people's deputies, and that measures are being adopted in accordance with them. This, comrade people's deputies, means about 38,000 specific instructions issued to us all and approved by meetings of voters and public organizations. Mandates are being given now in the course of the election campaign unfolding in the country for elections to republic and local organs of power.

The draft ends with an important section on guarantees of deputies' activities—legal, organizational, and material. They have been substantially enriched. The section develops the general principles envisaged by Article 7 on "Protection of the Rights, Honor, and Dignity of the Deputy."

The section contains many new elements. This applies specifically to the release of deputies from production or official duties to exercise their deputies' powers and the provision of accommodation for deputies to work, of organizational and technical resources, and transport. Provisions are made regarding the right to have secretarial assistants and voluntary assistants, the right to receive information, assistance on legal matters, the protection of deputies' labor rights, the protection of the rights of deputies who are servicemen, and so on.

Provisions regarding deputies' immunity have been significantly expanded and rendered more specific. This question can be resolved exclusively by the relevant soviet.

In compliance with instructions from the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet also prepared a draft Law on the Procedure for Recalling USSR People's Deputies.

The draft law proceeds from the premise that the recall procedure offers an effective guarantee of people's power which ensures a deputy's accountability to his voters. The recognition of this procedure constitutes one of the fundamental differences between the Soviet representative system and the traditional parliamentary system. The USSR Supreme Soviet committees and the chambers' commissions, when elaborating this draft, felt that the Law on Recall ought to primarily guarantee the rights and interests of voters. At the same time it ought to protect deputies against the groundless institution of recall proceedings and to establish mutual responsibilities between deputies and voters.

A USSR people's deputy may be recalled if he fails to justify the trust of the voters or the public organization. We analyzed in detail all the arguments "for" and "against" including in the law a detailed list of grounds for recall. Following numerous discussions, it was decided to affirm the position enshrined in the USSR Constitution and not to produce a specific list since it would be impossible to foresee all possible cases.

The starting point for the recall procedure is the hearing of recall proposals. The draft law establishes a procedure for the submission of relevant proposals and the recall mechanism, and sets deadlines for the hearing of recall questions by okrug electoral commissions or by electoral commissions for elections from public organizations, as well as the relevant procedure.

In the course of work on the draft it was proposed to vest the right to institute recall proceedings directly in okrug voters, labor collectives, and public organizations. In our opinion, such an approach would give rise to uncertainty among USSR people's deputies that the need to raise the question of a deputy's recall may arise due to dissatisfaction among even an insignificant number of voters. Therefore the draft provides certain measures ensuring the protection of people's deputies.

The right to institute recall proceedings against a USSR people's deputy elected from a territorial or national-territorial electoral okrug is vested in conferences of okrug voters, or at least 10 percent of okrug voters who have signed a recall petition. This procedure guarantees that a deputy may be recalled only when there are sufficient grounds and the okrug electoral commission has decided accordingly.

The right to raise the question of recalling a USSR people's deputy elected from a public organization is vested in its congress, conference, or a plenum of its all-union organ.

A fundamentally important element is introduced by the Article 5 provision to the effect that a ruling on the legitimacy of raising a recall question shall be given by the Central Electoral Commission for the Election of USSR People's Deputies. When the legitimacy of raising a recall question is confirmed, a vote shall be taken on the recall question.

The drafts expand the powers of electoral commissions on these matters.

The USSR Law on Elections of USSR People's Deputies assigns the obligations on recall to the Central Electoral Commission, as well as to okrug electoral commissions and electoral commissions for the election of USSR people's deputies from public organizations. But whereas the Central Electoral Commission is a permanent organ and its term of office runs for 5 years, the law says nothing to this effect as regards the other commissions, and they cease their activity after the elections. Therefore, in the event of recall proposals being received, electoral okrugs and public organizations will have to reconstitute them.

Comrade deputies!

These are the fundamental provisions of the draft legislative acts which were approved at sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet and its committees. The Supreme Soviet submits them for your consideration.

Slyunkov Address

PM2112095389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

["Lightning Interview" in Moscow 18 December with N.N. Slyunkov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, by correspondent G. Ovcharenko: "N.N. Slyunkov: 'The Debate Was Constructive'"]

[Text] To applause from deputies the Congress yesterday adopted a resolution on measures to improve the economy, on stages of the economic reform, and on fundamental approaches to the elaboration of the 13th 5-Year Plan. The previous day PRAVDA correspondent G. Ovcharenko interviewed USSR People's Deputy N.N. Slyunkov, member of the Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and chairman of the editorial commission for preparing the draft of this resolution.

"First of all," Nikolay Nikitovich said, "I would point out that the deputies conducted a principled but constructive discussion of the program advanced by the government. I am sure that the program was weightily enriched in the process of debate—for many businesslike suggestions were made."

[Ovcharenko] Which ones, precisely?

[Slyunkov] In my view, many speakers correctly drew attention to the fact that the scientific and technical progress section was poorly covered in the report. And yet scientific and technical progress and reform are the two main areas which can and must extricate our economy from its grave state. Therefore it was rightly stated that more attention must be devoted to scientific and technical progress in the plans for the 13th 5-Year Plan. I also agree with those who emphasized that all the conditions must be created for introducing the new mechanism of economic management, above all where the fate of material assets is decided—that is, in enterprises. In general, many remarks and suggestions were made. It is hard to examine them all in detail at once. But I can say one thing firmly: Sensible suggestions will be reflected both in the program itself and in the form of individual instructions to the government or the USSR Supreme Soviet.

[Ovcharenko] What, in your view, has to be done for the speediest realization of measures to improve the economy?

[Slyunkov] I share the viewpoint that it is necessary to adopt basic laws more quickly—on ownership, on land, on a unified tax system, on local self-management.

[Ovcharenko] But they have not yet undergone nationwide discussion, have they?

[Slyunkov] It is a question of something else: It is not enough to accelerate the adoption of laws. The chief thing, in my view, is to draw up and create a mechanism for bringing these laws into operation and to ensure their effectiveness. Laws must function, otherwise we cannot advance the economic reform. And here not only the USSR Council of Ministers but also the country's Supreme Soviet must have their say.

[Ovcharenko] Some people at rallies recently have not been averse to speaking of confusion in the ranks of the country's leadership. What will you say to this?

[Slyunkov] I will state firmly that there is no confusion. Yes, very many problems really have built up, whose profundity we could not have imagined 3-5 years ago for strictly objective reasons. But over the subsequent years we have highlighted urgent problems, as it were. A comprehensive analysis has been made of them, and their interdependences have been traced. Therefore we now have a clear idea of the stages of the economic reform and of the measures that must be taken to achieve positive results. The 1st year of the 13th 5-Year Plan is a year which must ensure stabilization, above all in the consumer market. And a year of improving finances. All the mechanisms and components of the system of radical economic reform will be comprehensively commissioned during the subsequent 2 years. And after 1993 economic levers will begin functioning—that is, the national economy's normal vital activity will begin.

[Ovcharenko] How do you assess the work of the Second Congress?

[Slyunkov] Positively. There is a constructive debate on all questions. This benefits the cause.

Premier Ryzhkov Addresses Congress 19 Dec

PM2012170589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report under the rubric "At Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies": "Government Program Supported"]

[Excerpts] The Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies continued its work in the Kremlin.

The 19 December morning session was chaired by M.S. Gorbachev.

Deputies set about discussing the Congress draft resolution "On Measures of Economic Recovery, Stages of Economic Reform, and Fundamental Approaches to the Elaboration of the 13th 5-Year Plan." [passage omitted].

Summing up the speeches in the main debate and today's proposals and comments, the chairman said that two approaches have emerged. The first is to support the USSR Government program, the second is to just take note of it.

Both proposals were put forward for deputies to examine,. Deputy Yu.E. Andreyev submitted a third proposal, which deems it necessary to hand back the government program for it to be reworked and for a new version to be submitted, while the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers must accept the resignation of those members of the government who were directly involved in elaborating the program that did not meet with this deputy's satisfaction.

Deputy N.I. Ryzhkov addressed the Congress.

N.I. Ryzhkov's Address to the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies

Comrade People's Deputies!

I do not intend to give a long speech or to substantiate the need for this address or the government's stance on questions that have already been voiced. I want to underline one thing—at the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies a detailed resolution was adopted which determined the main avenues and fundamental issues of the country's socioeconomic development. The government has made the appropriate proposals in accordance with the congress' instructions. The Supreme Soviet has deemed it necessary for them to be submitted for examination by the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

You have been discussing the government's program comprehensively for several days. In view of this I believe that the congress must not shirk its assessment but voice its own firm position: Either it supports the program put forward by the country's government with, of course, those comments made by people's deputies or it just takes note of it. I ask the congress to vote on the basis of these two proposals. At the same time I believe that the decision to just take note of the USSR Government program would mean this highly important document not winning the support of the congress. That is how the vague wording "take note of" must be interpreted. I would ask you to consider this before you begin voting. [passage omitted].

Stands by Program

PM1812162189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 19 Dec 89 First Edition p 1

[Interview with N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of USSR Council of Ministers, by S. Karkhanin under the rubric "Interview After the Session": "Vector of Stability"; date and place of interview not specified; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] As is well known, the debate on the government report has ended at the congress; USSR People's Deputies now have to adopt a resolution. What form will it take? In many respects the effectiveness of the economic reform depends on this. An interview which N.I. Ryzhkov gave SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA following his speech discusses the stance of the USSR Council of Ministers.

[Karkhanin] Nikolay Ivanovich, more and more often here at the congress one can hear people say that the government leadership is not united in its approach to the concept of reform, and a great deal is being said about "disappointed expectations." The polemics here at the congress showed the dissent among deputies. What comment can you make here?

[Ryzhkov] Certainly, there is a noticeable line aimed at driving a wedge between Ryzhkov, who is allegedly more conservative, and Abalkin and other members of the council of ministers presidium. But the document is our collective work, we have brooded over it for several months now, counting up, considering, and pondering all the options. I told academician G.A. Arbatov today, and I am prepared to repeat it once again: I signed the document and I am prepared to answer for it.

We must restore order in the country. Moreover, we must utilize both economic and administrative measures. It is no secret that economic levers are still not operating properly and leveling is still flourishing. Thus, if the country chooses the path we have proposed, it will prove possible to restore order.

Take the state order. Succumbing to public opinion, we made a mistake last year. It turned out that a machine builder received a state order of 25 percent while an oilman received one of 95 percent. How can petroleum be extracted if there is a shortage of equipment? As of 1991 we want to spend 2 years with a different system: 90 percent for everyone. We will set up a market from the remaining 10 percent, although it will be very difficult. This 10 percent will not fall to anyone who so chooses... but the combination of administrative and economic measures will be effective.

[Karkhanin] You are probably aware of people's dissatisfaction over the wage "freeze." This does indeed square badly with the policy of boosting people's standard of living...

[Ryzhkov] In November the rise in income reached 13 percent, while that in output production totaled 0.6 percent.... How can we balance the market? What economy can withstand this? In the first 11 months this year commodity turnover was 10 percent, this has never been the case in our lifetime! All manner of rumors and instability in society are causing people to scoop everything from the shelves without thinking whether they need a particular commodity. Of course, those people who have a fixed salary do not have such a rise in income. But there is a definite category of people who do.

[Karkhanin] But how would you view academician Arbatov's speech, which has had a very significant response?

[Ryzhkov] At the CPSU Central Committee Plenum, as a politburo member, I reported on the program which the government is proposing. And I think that the plenum participants were right when they expressed their attitude toward it and supported our concept. But comrade Arbatov was sitting there, too! Why did he not stand up? He should have said: comrade Ryzhkov, I do not support your program. But he didn't! He only spoke out here. That, in my view, is improper. Why he did that I do not know.

[Karkhanin] Nikolay Ivanovich, the problem of discipline now affects not only plan commitments but also each person's work at his own workplace. How are the disorganization, mismanagement, and pointless time losses in production to be eliminated?

[Ryzhkov] We must find ways and adopt a more rigorous approach. No one now, of course, will fire you for turning up 5 minutes late. But if you are not working then you must always remember that you should get out. We have forgotten that, it seems to me.

[Karkhanin] But what about the covert millionaires, rumors of whom are alarming people?

[Ryzhkov] Recently I answered that question from people's deputies. According to the statistics of the ministry of finances, the maximum deposit of money recorded in the Soviet Union is R200,000. But there is a point to be made here. Do you remember the sensational story of Artem Tarasov, who had R3 million? I thought that society's reaction to that would be very negative. But suddenly people began to praise and exalt Tarasov.... Who exalted him, did I? No, it was the press. Is that the kind of "ideology" we have today? One in which people say, go on, earn millions, you will be leaders of organizations.

Incidentally, you do not know, do you, how much the people's deputy election campaign cost some candidates? R80,000. And of course R80,000 can be "deducted" from R3 million....

[Karkhanin] Are you confident that the congress will support your program?

[Ryzhkov] I cannot speak for the deputies. Especially since I feel that the mood of the hall changes very quickly. Like the waves. Now implacability, now support. Nevertheless, I think that there is too much emotion.

[Karkhanin] But what will happen if the program doesn't receive congress' support?

[Ryzhkov] Others will produce a new program. Then it will not be Ryzhkov who mounts the platform but someone else. I am answerable for my program and I believe in it.

Moscow TV Carries 20 Dec Congressional Session

1300 GMT

LD2012142189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1300 GMT begins carrying a recorded relay of the 20 December session of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin in Moscow.

The relay begins by showing deputies taking their places. Gorbachev and Lukyuanov are shown on the platform. Gumbaridze is in the chair and announces that Mazurov, chairman of all-union veterans organizations has died. He asks deputies to stand to honor him. He then gives the floor to Deputy Kalmykov, chairman of the editorial commission for standing orders. He summarizes some of the deputies' views received on the subject of the congress's standing orders and outlines the commission's positions.

At 1336 GMT Gumbaridze reads out a question to Kalmykov from Deputy Markevich. Markevich poses his question and Kalmykov responds. Other deputies ask questions from the floor. They ask why certain of their proposals had not been taken into account and some ask how the interests of small republics are to be protected if their vital interests are not secured by a majority vote. Kalmykov explains that in such cases these matters were regarded as constitutional matters and the commission did not make decisions on them. Korotich, editor of OGONYEK, gets ready to speak. As the speaker before him finishes his speech, Gumbaridze says there is the proposal to end the questions and to proceed to a vote. A vote is taken: for 1,529; against 321; abstentions 21. Gumbaridze then puts it to a vote whether to accept the draft standing order as a basis. A vote is taken: for 1,755; against 64; abstentions 12; total 1,831. The standing orders are adopted as a basis.

1337 GMT

LD2012154789

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues its recorded relay of the 20 December session of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow.

The session continues with discusion of the standing orders.

At 1405 GMT, Gumbaridze calls for votes on individual sections and articles of the draft. Several deputies express views first on the standing orders.

At 1412 Gumbaridze calls for a vote on the first section of the draft. Result: 1,854 for; 19 against, 14 abstentions. Section declared adopted.

At 1415 Deputy (?Pavlicheck) comes to the rostrum, criticizing rules governing the languages which may be used at the session. He proposes that the free choice of language for speeches be guaranteed and puts forward an amendment to that effect. Gumbaridze reads out the procedure as it stands and reads out another proposal, regarding voting procedure.

At 1418 Gumbaridze calls for vote on proposal that only proposals submitted in writing to the commission and rejected by it be voted on. Result: 1,549 for, 303 against, 28 abstentions. Proposal accepted.

At 1422 Gumbaridze calls for votes to be taken on individual articles.

At 1423 Kalmykov returns to the floor and talks about the proposal regarding use of languages at the session.

At 1424 Gumbaridze calls for a vote on the proposal concerning use of languages. While voting proceeds, another deputy makes his own proposal on the issue, citing an analogy with UN procedure, describing the other proposal as a form of chauvinism. Gumbaridze says deputies will not be allowed in future to speak while a vote is being taken.

At 1427 Deputy (?Pavlichek) returns to the floor to reiterate his proposal.

At 1430 Gumbaridze warns that a problem in the voting system has arisen, because deputies have used it incorrectly. He announces vote on (?Pavlicheck's) proposal again. Result given: 707 for; 1,154 against; 34 abstentions. Proposal rejected.

At 1433 floor given to Deputy Khmura, who calls for a vote on the standing orders discussed by the Supreme Soviet.

At 1434 the floor is given to Deputy Primakov, who gives a procedural review of the history of the proposed standing orders. He proposes that the floor be given only to those who have put their names down and whose proposals have not been heeded. Gumbaridze calls for a vote on Primakov's proposal. Result: 1,659 for; 195 against; 27 abstentions. Proposal accepted.

At 1439 an unidentified deputy comes to the floor to make points of his own on the languages issue from the perspective of the non-Russian republics, calls for voting to be conducted by republics. If one or two republics reject a proposal, it should be sent back to the commissions.

At 1443 Kalmykov returns to the floor to reply to the unidentified deputy's remarks.

At 1445 Deputy Boyars from Latvia comes to the floor, proposing that non-members of the congress of repole's deputies should not have the right to interfere in the congress work and should be expelled from the hall.

At 1447 Lukyanov intervenes to reject Boyars' points: the only nonmenbers here are television staff. He proposes that a vote be taken on the issue.

At 1449 Gumbaridze calls for a vote on boyars' proposal. Result: 338 for; 1,511 against; 90 abstentions. Proposal rejected.

At 1452 Deputy Pilnikov from Karelia comes to the rostrum, making points on the concept of the republican group of deputies. Kalmykov replies, raising no objection to Pilnikov's proposal regarding the inclusion of autonomous republics' deputies in the above concept. Gumbaridze calls for a vote on the proposal. Result: 1,598 for; 244 against; 39 abstentions. Proposal accepted.

At 1456 Gumbaridze announces a 20-minute interval. The continuity announcer says the relay will continue in 15 minutes.

1511 GMT

LD2012180289

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1511 GMT resumes broadcasting a recording of the 20 December Second Session of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow. Lukyanov hands the floor to Naumov.

At 1515 GMT Deputy Korshunov takes the floor.

At 1517 Lukyanov makes a procedural point on the purpose of standing orders as an instrument to assist the conduct of debate.

At 1521 Deputy Landsbergis takes the floor, making a number of points concerning his reservations about the way in which republics are treated in voting procedures as envisioned by the standing orders.

At 1526 An unidentified deputy speaks from the floor. Lukyanov responds. Another unidentified deputy speaks from the rostrum. He is followed by a female deputy who speaks about the need for minority interests to be protected. She says that there have already been cases at the congress when for example Baltic republics and Armenia have found themselves unable to defend their own truths.

At 1530 Deputy Gryazin speaks from the rostrum. He is followed by an unidentified deputy and then the female deputy Arutyunyan, who says that people should have the right to express their view and to exercise the right of veto. She says that the congress is not the place to resolve this matter and proposes that it should be referred to the Supreme Soviet. She also warns against the possible dangers of either the congress or the Supreme Soviet becoming superfluous and stresses the need for a clear division of functions.

At 1534 an unidentified deputy says that republics already have the right to persuade the congress. If the congress is persuaded it will vote for their proposals. He warns against the danger of imposing the will of minjorities on the majority.

At 1537 Lukyanov sums up the points raised and points out that the right of veto does not exist. He says that there are many guarantees for the will of minorities written into the standing orders. He puts Landesbergis' proposal that the standing orders be remitted for further elaboration to the vote. 306 for; 1,531 against 61 abstentions. The proposal falls. He then puts the draft standing orders and the draft corrections proposed by the commission together to the vote. 1,704 for; 136 against; 42 abstentions.

At 1549 the floor is handed over to deputies who wish to make proposed amendments. Magomedov speaks from the rostrum on ensuring that each delegation gets an opportunity to speak. Kalmykov makes a brief point. Lukyanov replies and puts Magomedov's proposal to the vote. 730 for; 1,049 against; 96 abstentions.

At 1555 Deputy Afanasyev from Komi takes the floor and makes a proposal on republican representation on the presidium of the congress. This is put to the vote. Lukyanov says that the voting equipment isn't working properly. 555 for; 1,238 against; 84 abstentions.

At 1600 Deputy Lebov from Armenia takes the floor. His proposal that documents on proposals should be sent to deputies in good time is put to the vote. Votes are: 506 for; 1,318 against; 55 abstentions.

At 1609 another Deputy Grigoryan speaks from the rostrum proposing an article to heighten the tole of the congress to ensure that its decisions are fulfilled, and puts forward another proposal on curtailing the powers of the first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet. 301 votes for the first proposal; 1,438 against; 115 abstentions. 482 for the second proposal; 1,313 against 58 abstentions.

At 1618 Deputy Ivanov takes the floor. He says that there have been violations of the existing standing orders already, and gives an example concerning the order in which deputies speak. He proposes setting up a commission to ensure the observance of standing orders.

At 1620 an unidentified deputy says that the presidium and the secretariat should be trusted to ensure the standing orders are upheld. Ivanov however insists on a vote. The vote is put. 427 for; 1,384 against; 47 abstentions.

At 1624 Deputy Zelinskiy speaks and proposes a correction on the circulation of drafts. Lukyanov puts this to the vote. The voting equipment is again acting up. Lukyanov says it is tired. Before the results are given, an unidentified speaker complains about dragging out the discussion on standing orders. The congress has already voted to accept them. Deputy Muntyan seconds this view and urges deputies to work more actively. The result of the vote is 1,223 for; 449 against; 70 abstentions.

1631 GMT

LD2012180989

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues broadcasting a recording of the 20 December session of the Second USSR Congress of People's Deputies at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow.

At 1631 GMT a deputy from Dagestan speaks. Lukyanov responds and proposes that amendements should be sent to the editorial and the procedural commissions and that discussion on the subject should cease. 1,700 for; 111 against; 28 abstentions. Lukyanov says that for the standing orders to be adopted two further decisions have to be adopted: the first is to put the standing orders into effect. 1,729 for; 66 against; 32 abstentions. It is passed. The second proposal on unspecified consitutional changes having a bearing on standing orders is put to the vote. 1,739 for; 42 against; 49 abstentions.

An unidentified deputy then complains that USSR people's deputies are left out of the activities of the Supreme Soviet.

Lukyanov announces that a commission to organize the funeral of deputy mazurov is to be set up.

At 1647 GMT Gorbachev opens the evening session. He asks Slyunkov to speak about the government report. Slyunkov says that the majority of suggestions that have come into the commission have been included in the draft decision. These proposals include priority development for agriculture and the development of culture, aswell as ecology measures and ruble convertibility. Other proposals were not included in the draft decision—monetary reform, for instance. The commission asks the congress to adopt the draft decision, Slyunkov says.

At 1656 GMT Deputy Nazbekyan comes to the rostrum to argue the advantages of free enterprise zones, but they lack the necessary regulations to back them up. He urges appropriate amendments to the decision.

At 1658 GMT Deputy Korshunov says te decision should be passed without a detailed debate. After all, confidence has been voiced in the government.

At 1700 GMT Gorbachev asks for a vote on Korshunov's proposal. 1,646 for; 170 against; 36 abstentions. Gorbachev asks deputies to vote on the report as a whole. He asks for a revote for technical reasons. 1,590 for; 215 against; 84 abstentions.

At 1709 GMT Lukyanov introduces the topic of amendments to the Constitution concerning the electoral system. He reads out suggestions for amendments. A form of words to cover deputies from public organizations has been agreed by the drafting commission, Lukyanov says. Lukyanov puts the new draft of article 95 to the vote. 1,573 for; 306 against; 38 abstentions. After queries, Lukyanov reads out the new version again, which says that part of the deputies, if this is provided for in the constitution of the relevant republic, can be candidates from public organizations. Other parts of the article are thereby made redundant and a vote is taken on removing them. 1,806 for; 75 against; 34 abstentions. Lukyanov says Article 96 is now to be dealt with.

1726 GMT

LD2012185189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues its recorded relay of the 20 December session of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow.

At 1726 GMT an Estonian deputy disagrees with the wording proposed by the commission. Deputy Lippmaa asks why his proposal on linking the article to international law was not accepted. Lukyanov explains that a special law would be required to do such a thing. A deputy hits at the residence qualification.

At 1730 GMT Lukyanov reads out the amendment to Article 96 making infringements of voting rights punishable by law and calls for a vote. 1,686 for; 197 against; 45 abstentions. A deputy remonstrates from the hall. The next amendment to Article 96 is on people ineligible to vote. Should people undergoing compulsory medical treatment be ineligible? A vote is taken on proposed new wording. Amendment not accepted: 52 for; 1,263 against; 138 abstentions. Lukyanov calls for a vote on the election law as a whole. 1,743 for; 111 against; 53 abstentions.

Lukyanov says there will now be a debate on the status of deputies. There's still one and a half hours to go, Lukyanov says.

At 1744 GMT Deputy (Platonov) says he hopes the debate on status will be shorter than the earlier debates.

All USSR people's deputies should be actively involved in the proceedings of the Supreme Soviet and its commissions and committees.

At 1753 GMT Deputy Obolenskiy says the draft law does not solve all the problems, but it is a necessary law. People look to the people's deputies as their mandated representatives. Deputies have already encounterd closed doors, and one of the the articles of the law on status gives them greater rights of movement and access. Some deputies are demanding private cars for deputies. He runs out of time.

At 1806 GMT Deputy Lubenchenko notes that the Obolenskiy draft has also been approved by the interregional group. He thinks in the future consideration could be given to replacing recall of deputies by withdrawal of deputies mandates, as is practiced in mature democracies, and a list of offences drawn up.

Lukyanov announces an interval. The recording continues. Lukyanov reads out proposed members of commission to organize funeral of Deputy Mazurov, including Voronin, Lizichev, Belorussia's Sokolov, and others.

At 1817 GMT Deputy Ovchinnikov, Lieutenant General, says he disagrees with the Obolenskiy plan, because it makes immodest demands for office accommodation for deputies at a time when families live in inadequate flats. Deputies' duties should include defense of the homeland and this will strengthen the standing of the Army. Deputies should refrain from public statements based on rumors and unverified facts. OGONEK has been denigrating the Army and writing of the possibility of a military coup. Arbatov said the United States had started cutting its arms, but Bush has said that the United States has no need to cut its arms levels, and Arbatov's assertions were untrue. Gogol wrote that people are very keen to do other people's jobs for them, but they don't do their own properly.

1828 GMT

LD2012194389

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues its recorded relay of the 20 December session of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow.

At 1828 GMT Deputy Rogozhina makes specific proposals to enhance the position of kray, oblast, and local soviet deputies.

Deputy Shekhovtsov says that the Obolenskiy draft contains many useful points. Let us stand up for the rights of voters and the rights of people's deputies.

At 1838 GMT Deputy Shcherbak quotes Saltykov-Shchedrin to the effect that excessive centralization erodes independent action by individuals. He wants the committee's draft on status to be accepted as a basis for the future. As a member of the committee on ecology, he knows the electorates views on atomic power stations and radar installations. At the same time, the deputy should not be a puppet in the hands of the electorate. He must also assert his individual position. He has to listen to analysis of events in Eastern Europe from the BBC: Why aren't deputies better informed? He agrees with Lubenchenko and believes the clause on recall of deputies should be further refined. Let's be more polite to each other, as well! Sakharov has left us a valuable ethical legacy, let us be worthy of it.

At 1800 GMT Deputy Viktorovich talks about the issues that voters come to him with: housing, Chernobyl, food, ecology. Local bureaucracy is afraid of open information, so strengthening the deputy's status is required. He suggests amendments to individual clauses. Referring to the government program, he says it did not include deputies' demands for a cut in the administrative apparatus.

At 1901 GMT deputy Burbulis says today's package of laws should be regarded as key elements in the reform of the country, but deputies frequently find themselves dealing with matters that are not within their province. He proposes a fresh definition of deputies' activities and of the conditions under which they can be released from their professional duties. The Obolenskiy version contains useful initiatives. Why are Council of Ministers sessions not transmitted? The same applies to the Central Committee.

At 1915 GMT Lukyanov says we're running late. Deputies are asking about getting home after the congress. Will the completion date be altered? An announcement will be made tomorrow. Following completion of status, tomorrow's debates will focus on constitutional supervision. Minor announcements of venues for meetings of a number of deptuties' groups tonight are made.

The session concludes at 1919 GMT.

Further on 20 Dec Congressional Proceedings

Death of Deputy Mazurov

LD2012095989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0730 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] The Congress of USSR People's Deputies continued its work in the Kremlin today. Before the start of the morning session Deputy Gumbaridze, who is in the chair, announced with regret that USSR People's Deputy Kirill Trofimovich Mazurov, one of the major political, state, and public figures of the country, an active participant in the great patriotic war and chairman of the All-Union Council of War and Labor Veterans, died on 19 December. Deputies honored his memory with a minute's silence. [passage omitted]

Draft Regulations

LD2012104689 Moscow TASS in English 1026 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 20 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

At its morning session the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies again took up the issue of draft regulations of Congress and the USSR Supreme Soviet. The need to revise them was prompted by the fact that the regulations drafted in the pre-perestroyka period had become outdated.

Yuriy Kalmykov, of Saratov, who is chairman of the editing commission, said that after the report on draft regulations, made on December 16 by Yevgeniy Primakov, chairman of the Chamber of the Union, more than 70 deputies proposed amendments and more precise definitions. After summing them up, the commission suggested changes into 61 out of the 185 articles of the draft.

For example, the draft takes into consideration the deputies' proposal to hear regular annual reports on the situation in the country by the president of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The editing commission supported the proposal by some deputies that government candidates cannot be proposed for a second time after being rejected by the Supreme Soviet, as was the case during the election of the current government.

The commission did not support the proposal to establish a quorum for Congress and the Supreme Soviet of not less than two-thirds of deputies from each of the union republics.

Under the current regulations they are quorate if they are attended by two thirds of the total number of deputies. According to the chairman of the commission, the implementation of this proposal would paralyse the work of the country's supreme bodies of power.

Having stressed that the regulations should be permanently updated, Kalmykov asked the Congress to delegate to Congress the right to make those changes to it, which it deems necessary during its work.

Debates then began on amendments to the draft. During the discussion of amendments to the regulations, interethnic issues caused the most heated debates.

For example, deputies discussed the article that specifies Russian as the main language of Congress. Although the same article gives Deputies the right to speak in other national languages, provided they inform the Secretariat of the Congress in advance, Ukrainian poet Dmitriy Pavlychko regards it as discriminatory.

He said each deputy has the right to speak in any language of the Soviet Union without announcing it in advance. He was told that ensuring simultaneous translation into 130-odd languages of the Soviet Union is technically and financially unfeasible. The Ukrainian poet's proposal was rejected.

Deputy Vitautas Landsbergis, professor at Lithuania's State Conservatory, said in some cases voting should be done by republics and not by the members of the Congress as a whole. In this case decisions should be taken on the principle of consensus among the republics. The deputy claimed that today votes of deputies from several large republics, or even the Russian Federation alone, are enough to pass major laws without regard to the interests of other republics. Landsbergis said that if the draft regulations "are pushed through without the above-mentioned necessary amendments regarding the rights of republics, we will not take part in voting."

However this position was rejected by other deputies. For example, Deputy Kim Yong Ung, a lecturer at Omsk State University (Western Siberia), said that currently the Russian Federation cannot impose its will. Under the regulations Congress is only quorate with two thirds of deputies in attendance.

A Moscow deputy, Aleksandr Kraiko, added that Russian deputies, unlike those from Baltic republics, vote in the Congress in accordance with their views and not their national discipline.

The regulations were approved by 1,704 to 136 votes, with 42 abstentions.

Amended Economic Plan

LD2012185489 Moscow TASS in English 1619 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow Decemmber 20 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Congress of USSR People's Deputies today passed an amended resolution approving the government's economic recovery programme by a vote of 1,590 to 215. Eighty-four deputies abstained.

Editing commission chairman Nikolay Slyunkov said the final draft resolution incorporated the majority of proposals set forth during the programme's discussion, including agrarian deputies' proposal for the priority development of the agro-industrial sector and writer Chinghiz Aitmatov's proposal for creating the economic and legal foundations for cultural development.

The resolution augments the basic laws to be considered by the Supreme Soviet by adding bills on employment, joint stock companies, competition, anti-monopoly legislation and others.

It also included a proposal for drafting a programme for the transition to a convertible rouble.

At the same time, the commission rejected several amendments. One of them proposed a monetary reform in the country and another obliged the Supreme Soviet not only to consider but also to pass a number of laws.

The commission said the latter issue is in the Supreme Soviet's competence.

Languages, Voting Debated

LD2012135689 Moscow TASS in English 1308 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, December 20 TASS—During the discussion of amendments to the regulations, inter-ethnic issues caused the most heated debates.

For example, deputies discussed the article that specifies Russian as the main language of Congress. Although the same article gives Deputies the right to speak in other national languages, provided they inform the Secretariat of the Congress in advance, Ukrainian poet Dmitriy Pavlychko regards it as discriminatory.

He said each deputy has the right to speak in any language of the Soviet Union without announcing it in advance. He was told that ensuring simultaneous translation into 130-odd languages of the Soviet Union is technically and financially unfeasible. The Ukrainian poet's proposal was rejected.

Deputy Vitautas Landsbergis, professor at Lithuania's State Conservatory, said in some cases voting should be done by republics and not by the members of the Congress as a whole. In this case decisions should be taken on the principle of consensus among the republics. The deputy claimed that today votes of deputies from several large republics, or even the Russian Federation alone, are enough to pass major laws without regard to the interests of other republics. Landsbergis said that if the draft regulations "are pushed through without the above-mentioned necessary amendments regarding the rights of republics, we will not take part in voting."

However this position was rejected by other deputies. For example, Deputy Kim Yong Ung, a lecturer at Omsk State University (Western Siberia), said that currently the Russian Federation cannot impose its will. Under the regulations Congress is only quorate with two thirds of deputies in attendance.

A Moscow deputy, Aleksandr Kraiko, added that Russian deputies, unlike those from Baltic republics, vote in the Congress in accordance with their views and not their national discipline.

The regulations were approved by 1,704 to 136 votes, with 42 abstentions.

Electoral System Amendments

LD2012202989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1700 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] The Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR has adopted amendments to the Constitution ensuring a more democratic electoral system. A final (?vote in) of the resolution was passed today after three days of debates. The direct election of Deputies from public organizations proved the greatest controversy. After repeated analysis of conflicting opinions it was decided to allow each union or autonomous republic to decide that issue independently. The Congress, by an overwhelming majority, endorsed an amendment to the Constitution saying that any violation of the electoral rights of Soviet citizens is impermissible and punishable by law. Also today the Congress adopted a resolution approving the government's program for an economic upturn and granting it the powers it will need to implement the program.

There were heated debates on the bill on the status of People's Deputies of the USSR. It (?contained) guarantees of parliamentary activity in the protection of rights, honor, and dignity of the People's Deputies. Objections were voiced to the alternative draft put forward by Deputy Aleksandr Obolenskiy. His version suggests empowering People's Deputies to suspend orders issued by administrative bodies in their territories. The chairman of one of the houses of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Rafik Nishanov, said that this would mean the emergence of a new command and administrative system, this time represented by People's Deputies. A number of speakers pointed to the need for guaranteed access to mass media. Proposals for staffing special news editions of People's Deputies were made. The bill on the status of People's Deputies of the USSR is going to be put to the vote on Thursday.

20 Dec Congressional Speeches Reported

Slyunkov Address

LD2012191989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1648 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Remarks by Nikolay Nikitovich Slyunkov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the 20 December session of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies at the Kremlin Palace of Congress in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] Comrades people's deputies, the editorial commission has, in keeping with the congress's instructions, carefully examined all the remarks and proposals that were received on the draft resolution [on the government report]. The commission deemed it possible to include the majority of them in the draft that has been distributed to you today and that you have with you.

Some of the principal, major addenda that have been incorporated in the draft: Comrade Deputies Veprev, Fisinin, Stroyev and others proposed the inclusion in the draft of a provision obliging the Supreme Soviet and the government to create conditions for priority development of the agro-industrial complex and solving, social problems of the countryside. In the amended draft, included in the number of special purpose directives of the plan for the next 5-year plan period is a provision on improving food supply and diet, and in this connection the government has been instructed to provide in the plan specific measures for priority development of the agro-industrial complex, social amenities for the countryside, and development of scientific-technical progress. These amendments have been entered on page 7 and these provisions have been reflected on page 8 and 6.

Comrade Deputy Aytmatov indicated that in the draft little attention had been given to developing culture. In the amended draft, on page 7, it has been pointed out that special purpose directives of the 5-year plan should not only be strengthening the material-technical basis of public education and culture, as was the case in the previous draft, but also maximum satisfaction, on the principles of social justice, of the spiritual and cultural requirements of the population, creating economic and legal guarantees for the development of ethnic cultures and languages, and preserving historical heritage, in the text that was proposed.

Many deputies, Comrades Kuzin, Kalnynsh, Tsyplayev, Yaroshenko, Boyko, Skokov, Chabanov, and others proposed including—alongside the drafting of a law on the state bank, a banking system, and investment activity—draft legislative acts on employment, on joint stock companies, competition, and anti-monopoly laws. The proposal was made to implement measures to develop small and medium-sized enterprises, applied engineering centers, to invigorate foreign economic relations, and to draft other legislative acts connected with accelerating scientific-technical progress in direct connection with the implementation of the economic reform. The commission included in the draft resolution this instruction: to draft these laws and acts in 1990 and submit them to the Supreme Soviet. These instructions have been reflected on pages 4 and 5.

We all understand the need to take measures for overcoming the consequences of accidents and ecological disasters, which was spoken about here by Comrade Deputies Yaroshenko, Comrade Masol, Comrade Orlov, and many other deputies. The draft presented for your examination includes on page 7 the requirement to step up the ecological bias of the plan in keeping with the resolution of the USSR Supreme Soviet on urgent measures for the country's ecological recovery which was adopted by the Supreme Soviet, and apart from that, the document contains instructions to the government to draft the legal foundations and economic mechanism of ecological safety, eliminating the consequences of accidents and ecological disasters.

Instructions have also been given on establishing insurance funds to ensure the stability of the economy in cases of natural disasters, accidents, or catastrophes. That is reflected on page 2 of the draft.

Proposals from Comrade Deputies Nazarbayev, Prunskiene, Orlov, Skokov, Vologzin, and Tsyplayev on the elaboration and implementation of a statewide program to train cadres for work in new conditions of management have been taken into account. That point is reflected on page 5.

The elaboration in 1990 of a mechanism for interrelations among union republics and regions in a union-wide market is reflected on page 6.

A radical change in the content and mechanism of central planning in conditions of the economic reform is also on page 6.

The annual presentation of a report on the country's social and economic position to the USSR Supreme Soviet, which was submitted as a separate decision at the last session of the congress is reflected on page 8.

The elaboration next year of a program for the transition to the convertibility of the ruble: A point has been submitted concerning the impermissibility of the nonreturnable redistribution of resources earned by labor collectives, apart from the payments established by law. That's on page 4.

At the same time, there were some observations from deputies which the editorial commission did not consider it possible to take into account and to enter:

The deputy, Comrade Boyko, insisted that, in an instruction to the Supreme Soviet, where it is registered that fundamental laws are to be examined and adopted, he insisted that there should be a note saying that the laws should not only be examined, but also adopted. The editorial commission thinks that this comes within the competence of the Supreme Soviet. The Supreme Soviet can, in the process of examination, either adopt or not adopt individual clauses and documents in one form or another. Therefore, we did not consider it necessary to make such a note.

The proposal from Comrade Deputy (Davyatov) on conducting monetary reform and a referendum on that issue was also discussed and not adopted in the editorial commission. Therefore, those proposals have not been reflected.

The commission believes that the draft decision, to which the finishing touches have been applied, corresponds to the principal tasks and requirements in surmounting the present difficulties in the national economy, and that it opens up prospects for accelerating the economic reform. The commission requests the people's deputies to adopt the finished draft decision of the congress on measures to improve the state of the economy, on the stages of the economic reform, and on the main approaches to the elaboration of the 13th 5-year plan.

Ovchinnikov Report

LD2012222389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1817 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Remarks by Lieutenant General Aleksandr Ovchinnikov at the 20 December session of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies at the Palace of Congresses at the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] On the whole approving the law on the status of people's deputies of the USSR, drafted by the Supreme Soviet, I would ask for the following addenda to be made to it.

First, in the preamble, beside the words deputies' activity: supreme display of civic duty; its indisputable principle is concern for the needs of the electors; people's well-being and defense of the country, these words should be added: and defense of the homeland. This sacred task will help all of us, and especially deputies of the Baltic region and Transcaucasus, Moldavia, and certain other regions more actively to oppose those forces that are displaying a disrespectful attitude to the Army, concerning which regret was expressed by Comrade Gorbunov, chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic. This would enable us to get out of a situation that has taken shape in the country that only yesterday did not exist, i.e. refusing call-up for military service and blatant attacks and mockery of the very idea of serving the fatherland and attempts to drive a wedge in the unity of the Army and the people. [passage omitted]

Comrades, finally I propose that the following article be added to the law: a people's deputy of the USSR refrains from public statements and utterances based on rumors, fabrications, unauthenticated information, and in the case of deliberate distortion of the truth, should be subject to hearing in the ethics commission. [passage omitted]

The journal OGONEK, edited by USSR people's deputy Korotich, tries to depict the army and service as virtually the devil incarnate. This libel against the Army is accompaneid by a fabrication about the threat of military coup heard on the pages of OGONEK and in a speech by a people's deputy here at our congress, Comrade Tolpezhnikov from Riga.

The specific figures from Comrade Arbatov's speech can also be seen somewhat differently, but along approximately the same lines. I quote literally: in the United States the reduction of spending on defense has already begun and it will be continued; the official information from the U.S. Congress is that spending on the military budget for 1990 is $6.7 billion less than in the current year. Our Army, academician Arbatov declared, even after reduction, will number 1.5 million more than the American Army.

Well, first, it will not be 1.5 million more but only 460,000. If you take it by blocs then NATO has 6.5 [million] men and the Warsaw Pact has 5.1 million men. Genuinely 1.5 million more, but we do not have them, they do. It is important for deputies to know this. [applause] [passage omitted]

We admire the competence and professionalism of Western parliamentarians, but we do not reflect much on the fact that the high office of people's deputy does not in the least presuppose teaching the peasant how to plow and when to sow, how to smelt high-grade steel, extract coal, and construct bridges. Some of ours consider themselves major specialists in the sphere of agricultural production—not having lived one year in the country, knowing neither want nor cares—and argue on the principles of military construction, not having served a single day in the Army.

Here I would like, not abusing your attention, to recall the words of Nikolay Vasiliyevich Gogol, who wrote that it now seems to everyone that they can do much good in the place and post of another while they cannot do it at their own post. This is the forgiveness for all evils. This is how a classical writer thought and I agree with him.

Shcherbakov Remarks

PM2112105189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

["Partisan Monologue" by USSR People's Deputy V. Shcherbakov, chairman of Moscow City Trade Union Council: "Openly About Incomes"]

[Text] I am concerned, above all, about the waning prestige of honest labor. In my opinion, this is the chief brake on emerging from the crisis today. Discipline is declining, losses of worktime are growing, and cadre turnover is increasing. At the same time representatives of the "shadow economy" are constantly seeking ways to legalize their capital.

You probably have to agree with the government that the amounts of money can be reduced by selling shares, bonds, and treasury and exchange bills. As one means of improving finances it is possible to adopt the proposal to introduce a gold ruble. Of course, this measure in itself will not give us more goods, but it will inspire people with confidence in the ruble's soundness and eliminate feverish [azhiotazhnyy] demand. For we used to have an abundance of television sets, irons, carpets, and washing machines, and their production has not been reduced. The ruble must be brought to a common denominator—whether cash, noncash, foreign currency—with equal opportunities in the market for everyone and with the indispensable condition that "black money" and its possessors are dragged out for nationwide viewing.

No one can be deceived by the arguments that big money was long ago converted into real estate. The "shadow economy" functions as a living organism, and its capital is in circulation. The introduction of progressive income and inheritance taxation is clearly being dragged out. Even ways of legalizing "black money" are already being proposed. For example, if you want to buy a workshop and pay twice what it is worth or pay out five times what an apartment is worth....

Individual people have enough money for five apartments and even for a whole street, only what are the majority of honest working people to do about resolving the housing problem?

Why do certain people reject another means of separating black from white—namely, the replacement of bank notes? Why is the purport of the proposed reform distorted and the question of expropriating honestly earned money at once posed? Why not utilize the experience of other countries here and our own Decree on the Struggle Against Unearned Income?

We cannot fail to see today how a sharp property stratification of our society is taking place. We cannot fail to notice that the "shadow economy" is trying to ensure political power for itself. I share the alarm of the deputies who addressed the Congress at the link between local organs of power and mafioso circles. Incidentally, the chairman of the Union of Moscow Cooperative Members declared in the pages of OGONEK that Moscow cooperative members have spent R31 million on bribing state officials. So let us not only speak and write about this, but cut the ground from under those who give and from those who take bribes.

I believe that financial improvement is possible only if there is strong financial control with extensive powers.

I believe that it would be a good thing for the finance minister to inform the Congress of what is being done in practice to create a tax and financial control service in the country as quickly as possible, as befits our perestroyka. And I believe that it should not be departmental but accountable to the Supreme Soviet or the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

TASS Reviews 20 Dec Congressional Session

LD2012213589 Moscow TASS in English 2125 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 20 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies today adopted the regulations of the congress and the USSR Supreme Soviet. The new regulations were needed as the congress and the Supreme Soviet have relied until now on a document adopted in pre-perestroyka time.

After the draft regulations were submitted to the congress by chairman of the Council of the Union Yevgeniy Primakov on Saturday, more than 70 deputies submitted their amendments and remarks to the editing commission. The commission summed them up and proposed to amend 61 out the 185 articles of the draft regulations.

During the discussions of amendments to the regulations, inter-ethnic issues caused the most heated debates. For example, Deputy Vitautas Landsbergis, professor at Lithuania's state conservatory, suggested that in some cases voting should be done by republics and not by the members of congress as a whole. In this case decisions should be taken on the principle of consensus among the republics.

However, this position was rejected by other deputies. The regulations, including amendments, were approved by 1,704 to 136 votes, with 42 absentions.

At the afternoon meeting the Congress of USSR People's Deputies passed an amended resolution approving the government's economic recovery programme.

The resolution incorporated a number of proposals set forth during the programme's discussion.

The resolution augments the basic laws to be considered by the Supreme Soviet by adding bills on employment, joint stock companies, competition, anti-monopoly legislation and others. It also included a proposal for drafting a programme for the transition to a convertible rouble.

At the same time, the commission rejected several amendments. One of them proposed a monetary reform in the country.

The deputies adopted amendments to the law on amendments and supplements to articles of the Constitution of the USSR related to elections of republican and local government bodies.

Over the past two days there were many debates about the provision for the election of people's deputies by public organisations. (Under the Constitution of the USSR, a third of the number of congress seats is reserved for public organisations).

Those who are against this provision regard it undemocratic since one man-one vote principle is thus violated.

Those who favour this provision regard it as a guarantee of the representation in government bodies of the interests of the less secure categories of the population—disabled persons, war veterans, orphans.

The congress has finally adopted the version according to which a part of the number of people's deputies from union and autonomous republics can be elected by public organisations, if this is envisaged by the constitutions of the republics.

At the proposal of Deputy Viktor Alksnis from Latvia an amendment to the article on the procedure of elections was adopted. The article declares that any direct or indirect restriction of suffrage of Soviet citizens is impermissible.

After that the Congress of People's Deputies started deliberating a package of bills regulating the activity of the people's deputies. The congress will continue the debate on the package Thursday morning.

Yeltsin on Issues Facing Second Congress

PM1912170289 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 50, 10 Dec 89 p 10

[Unattributed interviews with three People's Deputies: "Congress Curtain-Raiser"]

[Text] 1. What decisions should the 2nd Congress of USSR People's Deputies adopt to be considered a success?

2. What can help the Congress to work constructively and what can hamper this?

MN [MOSCOW NEWS] asked three USSR people's deputies these questions. Their answers: [passage omitted]

Boris Yeltsin (Moscow): Defuse the processes involved in perestroika

1. The key issue is the state of the economy and the plan for the 13th five-year period. It is important that the 2nd Congress will at last—after one Congress and two sessions of the Supreme Soviet—adopt documents linked to the status of USSR people's deputies.

I am not satisfied with the Congress agenda. There is a need, I believe, for a report by the President of the Supreme Soviet on the work of the parliament, and a discussion of this report.

It stands to reason that the second session was more productive than the first. Nevertheless, there are still many shortcomings. Virtually the same people take part in all the discussions. Roughly half of the Supreme Soviet members never spoke at either the first or second session. There is shortage of organization in fulfilling the agenda, which often changes on the spot.

There was a major flaw with respect to fundamental legislative acts—on ownership, on enterprise, land, taxation, etc. At best, they were approved at the first reading and submitted for public discussion. In fact, 1990 has been lost for the implementation of these acts. As a consequence, the processes involved in perestroika have been arrested in the country.

The Congress is expected to discuss amendments to the USSR Constitution linked to the electoral system. To keep the new legislative acts from contradicting the Fundamental Law, the latter must be supplemented with amendments on ownership, socialist enterprise, land and the socio-political system.

Along with reports from other Congress-formed commissions, there is also a need to listen to the commission on privileges.

2. Unlike the first Congress, prepared mainly by the apparat, this one has been prepared by the deputies themselves. A special commission of deputies—some 60 persons—with Anatoliy Lukyanov at its head, has already met and formed subgroups, each working in a particular area.

At the past Congress, certain Moscow deputies were isolated form the main mass, and many regretfully failed to understand its salutary proposals. Today the interregional group of deputies is preparing its own proposals, but we shall try to proceed more gently, to avoid confrontation.

The problem is that little time has been allotted to the Congress—a mere 10 days. The situation in the country—some national or social eruption—could also throw a wrench in the works. [passage omitted]

Four Deputies View Personal Achievements

90UN0510A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 50, 16 Dec 89 p 2

[Report by L. Dubrovina: "'And What Have You Personally Done....'"]

[Text] Before the start of the congress and in the intervals between sessions we asked deputies: "What have you personally done in the 6 months since the First Congress of People's Deputies?" Unfortunately, only 4 of the 12 deputies answered such a seemingly elementary question. Evidently they cannot altogether be accused of having done nothing. Work has been done, and quite tangible work at that, but some declined to speak about it out of modesty, some for the reason that they believe they have not done enough. "It is difficult to objectively assess oneself," Colonel R. Aushev, hero of the Soviet Union, for example, told us.

But let us address facts. "I consider my main contribution the formation and conversion into a working body of the Interregional Group," economist G. Popov said. "Of course, I am not putting this down to my exclusive credit, but I have tried as far as possible to assist the formation of this group."

The personal contribution of Deputy V. Dikulya was the opening of a rehabilitation center for invalids, and Ye. Kogan, an engineer-mechanic from Tallinn, emphasized that deputies' work may be viewed at various levels. "Much," he said, "has to be done for the deputies of the local soviets—helping people obtain apartments, even having them repaired. I, for example, was able to prevent the eviction of one family. The second level of my activity as a deputy," Ye. Kogan continued, "is connected with problems of the republic. The main thing I managed to do was break through the information blockade and bring up our problems at the all-union level. A very interesting group of deputies is being formed currently and it will evidently be called 'Union'. Its purpose is the defense of civil rights and struggle against local separatism, egotism, and racial discrimination, if you will, against the Russian-speaking population in the republics."

Ye. Gayer, a research associate from Khabarovsk, also managed to get a considerable amount done. As a member of the Supreme Soviet Nationality Policy and Interethnic Relations Commission, she sought the inauguration of a subcommission on problems of small peoples, to whose fate she is far from indifferent. She is currently seeking the creation of an open-air museum near the village of Naykhin, where the most unique ancient rock carvings are located. At Ye. Gayer's insistence, Far East journalists have been accredited at the congress.

A reason why less has been done than might have been wished is the lack of deputy status. All deputies are agreed on this. Not all deputies have normal conditions for receiving visitors yet, and not all have assistants, although all have to answer letters and receive the electorate.

Political and Social

Lithuanian Communist Party Declares Independence

LD2012215889 Moscow TASS in English 2145 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Vilnius December 20 TASS—By TASS special correspondents:

The 20th Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party declared it today an independent political organisation with a programme and rules of its own.

After a fiery debate that revealed the irreconcilability of views on the further development of the Lithuanian Communist Party thue delegates decided by a roll-call vote to change the party's status. The decision was carried by a majority of 855 out of the total 1,033 delegates.

The resolution on the matter says among other things, that the 20th congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party implementing the will of the majority of Communists resolves to reorganise the Lithuanian republican organisation of the Soviet Communist Party into an independent Communist Party of Lithuania.

The Communist Party of Lithuania, the resolution states, is a component of the political system of Lithuania uniting on a voluntary basis citizens of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic who support the aims of the Communist Party of Lithuania.

The party proclaims its aims in the programme of the Communist Party of Lithuania and realises them within the framework of the Constitution and laws of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist republic.

The Communist Party of Lithuania, the resolution said further, will strive for maintaining equal partnership relations on the basis of democratic ideas with the communist Party of the Soviet Union, other democratic parties, public organisations and movements.

An independent democratic Lithuanian state should be viewed as the principal objective of the Communist Party of Lithuania.

This decision was preceded by an intense political discussion that marked the congress's work from its very first minutes. In fact, it all boiled down to two main viewpoints on the further development of the Communist Party of Lithuania. These two viewpoints that were made clear in the course of the debate at the congress were later formulated as the basis for taking a vote. One favoured a fully independent Communist Party of Lithuania, the other—an independent Communist Party of Lithuania within the framework of the renewed Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Many delegates stressed the danger of political extremes. Speaking about the extraordinary significance of hte questions raised at the congress they proposed to solve them with the participation of all communists of the republic. A referendum was suggested. The motion was put to the vote and declined by a majority.

Fiery debates were caused by the form of ballot. Many delegates favoured secret ballot. They said that moral terror, dismissal from work and continuous threats to people with an opinion of their own were not excluded and that called for a secret ballot. However this point of view was not taken into account.

The congress decided to hold a roll-call vote and publish the lists in a special bulletin afterwards.

The congress will continue work on Thursday to discuss and approve the rules and the programme of the Communist Party of Lithuania.

Congress Debate Reported

PM2112102789 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "At Lithuanian Communist Party Congress"]

[Text] Vilnius—Yesterday the Lithuanian Communists' 20th Congress declared the Lithuanian Communist Party to be an independent political organization with its own program and statute.

After a keen discussion which demonstrated irreconcilability in views of the path of the Lithuanian Communist Party's development, as a result of a roll-call vote the congress delegates expressed themselves in favor of changing the status of the Communist Party of Lithuania.

The resolution on this question states in particular that the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress, fulfilling the will of the majority of Communists, resolves to reorganize the Lithuanian republican CPSU organization into an independent Lithuanian Communist Party.

The Lithuanian Communist Party, the document states, is a component of the Lithuanian political system which unites on a voluntary bases those citizens of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] who support the aims of the Lithuanian Communist Party. The party proclaims its aims in the Lithuanian Communist Party Program and implements them while observing the Constitution and laws of the Lithuanian SSR.

The Lithuanian Communist Party, the resolution continues, will seek to support equal relations of partnership on the basis of democratic ideas with the CPSU and other parties, public organizations, and movements.

This complex decision was preceded by a keen political debate which developed in the first minutes of the congress' work. Essentially two viewpoints emerged at the party forum regarding the further path of the Lithuanian Communist Party. They subsequently formed the basis of the voting slip. One opinion was for a fully independent Lithuanian Communist Party, the other for an independent Lithuanian Communist Party within a renewed CPSU.

Many congress delegates voiced the thought that extremes in politics are a dangerous matter. Speaking of the extraordinary seriousness of the questions raised at the congress, they suggested that they be resolved only with the participation of all the republic's Communists. There was talk of a referendum. For instance, this was mentioned by E. Titishkis, first deputy chairman of the Lithuanian SSR People's Control Committee; S. Serzhantovich, tractor driver at the "Pyargale" collective farm, Vilnyusskiy Rayon; and V. Shved, first secretary of the Oktyabrskiy Lithuanian Communist Party Rayon Committee in Vilnius. In particular the latter said: "The new status means splitting the party. Is it democratic to announce the independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party without an all-party referendum?"

But there were also other views. L. Alishkyavichyus, a worker from a farm in Kaunasskiy Rayon, warmly defended his position: "Lithuania does not need a party which does not declare Lithuania's independence."

"Those who are agitating for a Lithuanian Communist Party within the CPSU do not recognize the peoples' right to self determination," Academician and People's Deputy E. Vilkas said categorically.

The question of holding an all-party referendum was put to the vote and rejected by the majority of delegates.

Heated disputes were generated among the delegates by the form the vote should take. Many expressed themselves in favor of a secret ballot. They cited serious arguments: Moral terror, dismissal from work, constant threats for having a different opinion from other people. But their viewpoint was not considered.

The congress adopted the decision to hold roll-call voting with the subsequent publication of the lists in a special bulletin.

Some 855 of the 1,033 delegates voted to change the statuts of the Lithuanian Communist Party.

The congress will continue its work today. The delegates are to discuss and adopt the Lithuanian Communist Party Statute and Program.

Moscow TV on Debate

LD2012224289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 20 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Our correspondents report from the 20th Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party. [Video caption names correspondents as B. Beketov and A. Paulyus]

[Beketov] Today is the second day of the work of the congress. It turns out that we have been here now a whole week. So many events, opinions, emotions and problems have come together and fitted into this short space of time, and the fact that the congress is taking place in this glass palace which can be viewed from everywhere and which in turn looks out in all four directions acquires indeed a symbolic importance.

Despite our desire to keep you up-to-date we are unable to send the "Vremya" program all the news. The fact is that the congress does not fit in with a normal working day, and at present as this reportage is being transmitted, its sittings are continuing. A few words then about the debate which started yesterday. Twenty persons spoke on the Central Committee's report. The speakers represented various party organizations, towns, and rayons of the republic. Their opinions, assessments, proposals, and demands were also very diverse. However, despite all the varying arguments the main issue was and will remain the eternal issue, which is now timely as never before—namely, what life is to be in the future. [Video shows congress sitting underway]

Speakers at today's morning sitting took up this issue as though it were a relay baton. Here is how diversely it sounded in the speeches by (Shved) and (Rimas), rayon committees secretaries.

[Begin recording] [(Shved)] It is extremely important at the present time not to permit a split of the CPSU into national parties. The adoption by the congress of a decision on the new status of the Lithuanian Communist Party is in effect the beginning of the split of the CPSU.

[(Rimas), in Lithuanian with superimposed Russian translation] If we Communists living in Lithuania do not avail ourselves of this historic chance to become an independent party the list of the Communist Party's mistakes will have a further entry. The level of economic independence that has been achieved and the multiparty system entering the political life of Lithuania call us to combine the status of the Communist Party with the status of a sovereign republic. [end recording] [passage omitted]

[Beketov] In the afternoon two decision options were put to the Congress delegates for name voting. The first option was formulateed as follows: "For an independent Lithuanian Communist Party with its own program and status." The second option was: "For an independent Lithuanian Communist Party within the composition of a renewed CPSU." We intend to report the results of the voting as soon as we receive the information. [Video shows further pictures of congress proceedings]

[Announcer] We have just been informed from Vilnius that the majority of the congress delegates voted for an independent Lithuanian Communist Party with its own program and status.

'Alternative Conference' Planned

LD2112135789 Moscow TASS in English 1339 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Vilnius December 21 TASS—About 160 delegates to the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of Lithuania, who voted against changes in the party's status and its withdrawal from the Soviet Communist Party, held a conference last night.

While being firmly committed to the Soviet Communist Party's platform and unwilling to split its ranks, the delegates intend to continue participating in the Lithuanian Party Congress.

This morning they told the Congress that having voted for an independent Communist Party of Lithuania within the renewing Soviet Communist Party, they decided to hold a party conference.

The aim of the conference is to rally Lithuanian Communists who share the idea of the party's independence within the Soviet Communist Party.

An organising bureau for the conference was set up to conduct routine work. The bureau is expected to take part in preparations for an extraordinary congress of communists who remain on the platform of the united Soviet Communist party.

In an interview with TASS, Juozas Kuolialis, a member of the organising bureau and adviser at the republican Supreme Soviet Presidium, said:

"The communists adhering to Marxist-Leninist positions will actively participate in perestroika and work in the republic's party organisations to prepare for the 28th Soviet Communist Party Congress.

"As to our relations with the reorganised, independent Communist Party of Lithuania, for which more than 80 per cent of the delegates voted, they will rest on an equal, parity footing."

Asked how many delegates support the idea of the alternative conference, Kuolialis said that about 160 delegates spoke in favour. they represent more than 50,000 party members, or a quarter of all Lithuanian communists.

The idea would have had more supporters had yesterday's vote on the status of the Communist Party of Lithuania been secret, rather than a roll-call, Kuolialis remarked.

At the Congress delegates spoke with concern that moral pressure is being exerted on the communists who have different views.

"We believe that the Communist Party of Lithuania gave in to pressure from opposition forces in the republic, as the 20th Congress has shown," Kuolialis said. "In our view, the Communist Party leadership has become a tool in the hands of Sajudis."

The participants in the conference told the Congress that they would abstain from voting on the draft programme and rules of the Lithuanian Communist Party submitted for consideration today.

The Congress took note of their information.

Vilnius Radio Carries 20 Dec CP Congress

0710 GMT

LD2012163789

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0710 GMT on 20 December carries a live relay of the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Extraordinary Congress being held in Vilnius. While the delegates are taking their seats Vilnius radio correspondents read the declaration and the resolution on Lithuanian Communist Party independence, which are currently under discussion:

"The Lithuanian Communist Party declaration of independence. The 20th congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party states that the present state of the Lithuanian Communist Party, consolidated within the CPSU rules as a territorial organization, does not correspond with the interests of the majority of the republic's communists and their striving to independently solve the problems of the party's work and take part in the life of Lithuania. The congress announces that the CPSU's Lithuanian Republic organization is becoming an independent Lithuanian Communist Party with its own program and statute. It operates in accordance with Lithuania's constitution and laws. The congress expresses itself in favor of the Lithuanian Communist Party having equal ties and cooperation with the CPSU and with the communist parties in other republics as stipulated by the proximity of the reconstruction's strategic aims.

"The contents and progress of relations between the Communist Party of Lithuania and the CPSU will depend on mutual goodwill and mutual understanding, reconstruction in the CPSU, and the results of the 28th congress.

"The congress appeals to the republic's communists to unite in the name of the common aim—establishing an independent Lithuanian state and of a democratic society."

The announcer states that this is the first document which is being discussed by the congress delegates. The announcer adds that also under discussion is resolution of the Lithuanian Communist Party Congress on changing the statute of the Lithuanian Communist Party. The five items of this resolution read:

"The 20th Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party, complying with the wishes of the majority of the communists resolves:

"1. To reorganize the CPSU republican organization into an independent Communist Party of Lithuania.

"2. To adopt the following statute of the Communist Party of Lithuania: The Communist Party of Lithuania, an independent political organization, has its own program and statute. The Communist Party of Lithuania is a component part of Lithuania's political system uniting Soviet Lithuania's citizens on a voluntary basis, supporting the aims of the Communist Party of Lithuania. The party announces its aims in the program of the Communist Party of Lithuania and implements it in accordance with the Soviet Lithuanian Constitution and laws. The Communist Party of Lithuania maintains equal partnership relations with the CPSU and with other parties, public organizations, and movements.

"3. The most important task of Lithuania's communists is Lithuania's independence the development of a democratic society, and the implementation of humanist ideals of socialism, of personal freedom and justice, the creation of normal living conditions for the Lithuanian nation and all the inhabitants in Lithuania.

"4. The declaration of independence of the Communist Party of Lithuania will be published.

"5. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Lithuania is to be instructed to establish the order of implementing the statute of the Communist Party of Lithuania."

At 0715 GMT, Academician Eduardas Vilkas takes the floor expressing support for an independent Lithuanian Communist Party.

At 0727 GMT, delegate Matulionis announces the results of a survey carried out among the delegates of this congress. These results were: 61% favor an independent Lithuanian Communist Party, 12% oppose a split. There were also communists not interested in matters of the party any more.

At 0800 GMT after a series of remarks by delegates, K.Prunskiene takes the floor. He says that there are reactionary members of the CPSU who oppose the idea of economic self-reliance. She calls upon the deputies to vote for an independent Lithuanian Communist Party.

At 0805 GMT Algimantas Brazaitis takes the floor. He speaks about the documents under discussion and the basis for the very existance of the Lithuanian Communist Party, saying that 77 percent of the population still currently stand for socialist values. The Lithuanian Communist Party is the only party which has the possibility of maintaining the linking channel with the USSR. Other parties do not have this possibility. He proposes editing the last paragraph of the declaration in order to soften the blow for M.Gorbachev.

At 0812 GMT the debates are declared concluded by a majority of votes.

An unidentified speaker in Russian says that it is a blasphemy to have the card of one party in one's pocket and at the same time discuss setting up yet another party. He says that this is possible only if Lithuanian communists trade in their party cards starting with the Central Committee. In response to this, Lionginas Sepetys, presiding over the session, orders the microphones switched off.

0902 GMT

LD2012164889

[Editorial Report] At 0902 GMT on 20 December, Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian continues its live coverage of the Lithuanian Communist Party congress in Vilnius. Delegate Oleskevicius takes the floor and supports the proposal to set up an independent Communist Party of Lithuania and adopt a resolution which will declare this. Further, the delegate proposes that after this declaration has been adopted this congress be renamed first constituent congress of the independent Lithuanian Communist Party.

At 0909 GMT delegate Uosis, followed by delegate Liutikas give full support to the proposal to make the Communist Party of Lithuania independent.

At 0909 GMT delegate Yakubosky, speaking on behalf of 4,000 communist fishermen of Klaipeda, appeals to the communists of this republic to work hard and to be honest people. He says that it does not really matter if the Lithuanian Communist Party is independent or not. The fishermen will be happy with either.

At 0923 GMT, Kuolelis, member of the Central Committee says that as a result of deteriorating reception and constant applause, meant to interrupt the speaker, listeners are finding it impossible to cover the proceedings.

At 0931 GMT, Domas Sniukas reviews the documents under discussion.

At 0934 GMT, delegate Zalys from Klaipeda reads a message from 700 communist fishermen from Klaipeda supporting an independent Communist Party of Lithuania.

At 0935 GMT, Egidijus Bickauskas makes a short statement that name by name ballots have been in use in many parliaments in western democracies. Therefore, he does not regard this as moral pressure on the voters. He also makes several suggestions concerning the documents, the texts of which are not known to the listeners. The delegates were given the texts before the start of the congress session.

At 0940 GMT, the congress is adjourned for 20 minutes.

At 1010 GMT, the relay is resumed from the Vilnius Opera House where the congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party is taking place. While the delegates are taking their seats Vilnius radio announcers read the the declaration and the resolution which are currently under discussion.

"The Lithuanian Communist Party declaration of independence. The 20th congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party states that the present state of the Lithuanian Communist Party, consolidated within the CPSU rules as a territorial organization, does not correspond with the interests of the majority of the republic's communists and their striving to solve independently the problems of the party's work and take part in the life of Lithuania. The congress announces that the CPSU's Lithuanian Republic organization is becoming an independent Lithuanian Communist party with its own program and statute. It operates in accordance with Lithuania's constitution and laws. The congress expresses itself in favor of the Lithuanian Communist Party having equal ties and cooperation with the CPSU and with the communist parties in other republics as stipulated by the proximity of the reconstruction's strategic aims.

"The contents and progress of relations between the Communist Party of Lithuania and the CPSU will depend on mutual goodwill and mutual understanding, reconstruction in the CPSU, and the results of the 28th congress.

"The congress appeals to the republic's communists to unite in the name of the common aim—establishing an independent Lithuanian state and of a democratic society."

The announcer states that this is the first document which is being discussed by the congress delegates. The announcer adds that also under discussion is resolution of the Lithuanian Communist Party Congress on changing the statute of the Lithuanian Communist Party. The five items of this resolution read:

"The 20th Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party, complying with the wishes of the majority of the communists resolves:

"1. To reorganize the CPSU republican organization into an independent Communist Party of Lithuania.

"2. To adopt the following statute of the Communist party of Lithuania: The Communist Party of Lithuania, an independent political organization, has its own program and statute. The Communist Party of Lithuania is a component part of Lithuania's political system uniting Soviet Lithuania's citizens on a voluntary basis, supporting the aims of the Communist Party of Lithuania. The party announces its aims in the program of the Communist Party of Lithuania and implements it in accordance with the Soviet Lithuanian Constitution and laws. The Communist Party of Lithuania maintains equal partnership relations with the CPSU and with other parties, public organizations, and movements.

"3. The most important task of Lithuania's communists is Lithuania's independence the development of a democratic society, and the implementation of humanist ideals of socialism, of personal freedom and justice, the creation of normal living conditions for the Lithuanian nation and all the inhabitants in Lithuania.

"4. The declaration of independence of the Communist Party of Lithuania will be published.

"5. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Lithuania is to be instructed to establish the order of implementing the statute of the Communist Party of Lithuania."

1015 GMT

LD2012171289

[Editorial Report] At 1015 GMT, the proceedings at the Lithuanian Communist Party Congress resume with Academician Eduardas Vilkas taking the floor and expressing support for an independent Lithuanian Communist Party.

At 1027 GMT, delegate Matulionis announces the results of a survey carried out among the delegates of this congress. These results were: 61 percent favor an independent Lithuanian Communist Party, 12 percent oppose a split. There were also communists not interested in matters of the party any more.

At 1032 GMT, Delegate Baltrunas, secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee reiterates the objectives set yesterday by A.Brazauskas, to set up an independent Lithuanian Communist Party. The secretary calls for unity and to avoid a split in the ranks. He also supports name-by-name voting.

At 1038 GMT, Ringelis from Ukmerge proposes to include a statement in the documents declaring that the objectives of the CPSU and those of the Lithuanian Communist Party are not identical at present.

At 1040 GMT, a serviceman speaking in Russian, although of Lithuanian nationality, says that yesterday's speech made by his colleague was not a threat. He supports the idea of a referendum on the issue and on a united CPSU.

At 1045 GMT, Prof Kucherov, an active member of the Yedinstvo interfront, says in Russian that he opposes the proposed independence of the Communist Party of Lithuania.

At this point, reception deteriorates to fair-poor.

At 1052 GMT, R.Kasauskas, a writer, takes the floor. He says that the minority is introducing the split and imposing a debate which had been declared concluded. He mentions Kucherov's name and said that such people do not respect the language of this republic, the customs, and the people. He says that he is sure most honest people will leave the party if the Lithuanian Communist Party does not gain independence here today. Only those who have no ideals and ambitions will remain in the Lithuanian Communist Party. Kasauskas quotes Gorbachev about the self-determination of all nations and says that this does not only apply to the people of Eastern Europe—Lithuanians are good enough to enjoy this right too.

At 1100 GMT K.Prunskiene takes the floor. He says that there are reactionary members of the CPSU who oppose the idea of economic self-dependence. She calls upon the deputies to vote for an independent Lithuanian Communist Party.

At 1105 GMT Algimantas Brazaitis takes the floor. He speaks about the documents under discussion and the basis for the very existance of the Lithuanian Communist Party, saying that 77% of the population still currently stand for socialist values. The Lithuanian Communist Party is the only party which has the possibility of maintaining the linking channel with the USSR. Other parties do not have this possibility. He proposes editing the last paragraph of the declaration in order to soften the blow for M.Gorbachev.

At 1112 GMT, the debates are declared concluded by a majority of votes.

An unidentified speaker in Russian says that it is a blasphemy to have the card of one party in one's pocket and at the same time discuss setting up yet another party. He says that this is possible only if Lithuanian communists trade in their party cards starting with the Central Committee. In response to this, Lionginas Sepetys, presiding over the session, orders the microphones switched off.

1120 GMT

LD2012174289

[Editorial Report] At 1120 GMT Lithuanian Communist Party First Secretary Brazauskas takes the floor, announcing that the following edited version of the draft declaration and the draft resolution are submitted to the congress:

"The Lithuanian Communist Party [CP] declaration of independence. The 20th Congress of the Lithuanian CP states that the present state of the Lithuanian CP consolidated in the CPSU rules as a territorial organization does not correspond with the interests of the majority of the republic's communists and their desire to independently solve the problems of the party's work and take part in the life of Lithuania. The congress declares that the CPSU's Lithuanian Republic organization is becoming an independent Lithuanian Communist Party with its own program and statute. It operates in accordance with Lithuania's Constitution and laws. The congress expresses itself for the Lithuanian Communist Party's equal ties and cooperation with the CPSU and the communist parties in other republics and countries stipulated by the proximity of the reconstruction's strategic aims. [as heard]

"The contents and progress of relations between the Communist Party of Lithuania and the CPSU will depend on mutual understanding, the progress of reconstruction in the CPSU, and the results of the 28th Congress.

"The congress appeals to the republic's communists to unite in the name of the common aim—the establishing of an independent Lithuanian state and of a democratic society."

Brazauskas then reads the draft resolution:

"The 20th Congress of the Lithuanian CP, complying with the wish of the majority of the communists resolves:

"1. To reorganize the CPSU republican organization into an independent Communist Party of Lithuania. "2. To adopt the following statute of the Communist Party of Lithuania: The Communist Party of Lithuania, and independent political organization, has its own program and statute. The Communist Party of Lithuania is a component part of Lithuania's political system uniting on a voluntary basis Soviet Lithuania's citizens supporting the aims of the Communist Party of Lithuania. The party announces its aims in the program of the Communist Party of Lithuania and implements it in accordance with the Soviet Lithuanian Constitution and laws. The Communist Party of Lithuania will strive to maintain equal partnership relations with the CPSU and other progressive parties, public organizations, and movements.

"3. The most important aim of the Lithuanian CP is an independent democratic Lithuanian state and the implementation of humanist ideals of socialism, of personal freedonm and justice, the creation of normal living conditions for the Lithuanian nation and all the inhabitants in Lithuania. "4. To instruct the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Lithuania to establish the order of implementing the statute of the Communist Party of Lithuania basing itself on the documents adopted by the congress."

1140 GMT

LD2012180489

[Editorial Report] At 1140 GMT a ballot on the proposed documents is started. It is proposed that the Declaration and the Resolution should be confirmed in the edited variant as starting points. A total of 850 vote in favor of the declaration, 139 vote against, and 14 abstain. A total of 838 vote in favor of the resolution, 142 against, and 10 abstain.

At this point reception deteriorates to fair-poor. When reception improves a debate is in progress about the manner in which ballots should be carried out. The majority propose to hold a ballot by name, this is, filling in the voting papers which clearly state the proposition for or against the independent Communist Party of Lithuania as well as the name of the delegate and the number of his mandate.

The debate lasts until 1240 GMT when the proposal to end the debate is supported by the majority of delegates.

There is a proposal that the results of the by name votes should be made public in the republican press. A total of 867 delegates vote in favor of the proposal, and 97 delegates are against.

At 1255 GMT discussions are held on details of the ballot, for example, when a voting paper would be invalid. It is announced that the voting will start at 1400 GMT and be over by 1500 GMT.

The session then ajourns until 1500 GMT.

When the live relay of the congress from the Vilnius Opera house resumes at 1500 GMT, the radio announcer says that at the moment the delegates are taking a vote on the status of the Lithuanian CP. The announcer says that two alternatives are given for the delegates: To vote for the independent Lithuanian CP with its program and statute or to vote for an independent Lithuanian CP Central Committee within the framework of the renewed CPSU.

Vladimiras Beriozovas, second secretary to the CP Central Committee announces that until the votes have been counted and the results announced furter debates on other items of the agenda cannot be held. The delegates are informed that a bell will summon them to the hall to resume work.

The Vilnius Radio announcer says that the Lithuanian radio will continue the program from the radio studio. He invites the listeners to listen to music, which starts at 1510 GMT.

At 1610 GMT the live relay from the Vilnius Opera House is resumed. The announcer announces that all the delegates are now expecting the results to be announced. Algirdas Brazauskas takes his place in the Presidium.

At 1616 delegates are given the voting papers.

At 1620 GMT Arvydas Matulionis, chairman of the Vote Counting Commission, takes the floor. He announces that because of remarks written by delegates in the voting papers the work of the commission was made difficult. He says that although it was clear that the majority of delegates voted in support of the first alternative—a fully independent Lithuanian CP—it was not clear if this majority was 850 or 846. He apologizes for the delay. The Vote Counting Commission resumes its work.

At 1620 GMT another break is announced and music is broadcast.

At 1712 GMT the live relay is resumed from the Vilnius Opera House where the results of the ballot on the independence of the Lithuanian CP is expected to be announced.

At 1713 GMT the results are announced: 855 delegates voted in favor of independent Lithuanian CP with its own statute and program; this number comprises 82,.8 percent of the total of votes. Stormy applause is heard. The number voting in favor of a self-dependent Lithuanian CP in the renewed CPSU was 160.

The total number of delegates participating in the ballot was 1,033.

1720 GMT

LD2012183389

[Editorial Report] At 1720 GMT the congress is heard discussing the issue of partnership with the CPSU and other parties—the issue which has been mentioned in the declaration.

A number of proposals concerning each paragraph of text of the resolution are carefully discussed; some words are changed and structures of sentences altered, but the main idea of the resolution remains.

A question is raised concerning the period between the end of this congress and the plenum of the Central Committee when the statute of the party will be legally changed in practical terms. Discussion focuses on which party rules will be in force during this period.

At 1803 GMT the chairman proposes to vote on the resolution after the proposals have been taken into consideration and the text changed accordingly. 853 delegates vote in favor of the resolution.

Deputy Yermalovich reads a statement issued by those who voted against the independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party stating that they protested against the adopted Resolution and the Declaration about the independence of the Lithuanian CP.

At 1810 GMT the Congress is adjourned until 0800 GMT on 21 December.

Lithuanian Party Congress 21 Dec Morning Session

LD2112093389

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0800 GMT on 21 December begins a live relay from Vilnius of the Lithuanian Communist Party congress in its third day of proceedings.

The congress relay begins with several announcements. The first announcements concern delegate Grigalius' request to make his voting papers valid, apologizing for his absentmindedness because he forgot to sign his voting paper. He said he voted for fully independent Lithuanian communist party, the congress satisfied his request.

The second announcement concerns the rehabilitation of Juozas Bulavas, once rector of Vilnius university and Communist Party member, expelled from the ranks of the party in the 1960's for alleged nationalist activities.

Several other announcements are made; an address with heartiest congratulations is made by A. Macaitis, first secretary of the Lithuanian Komsomol. Macaitis says that those who were prepared to leave the congress in protest should remember the example of the komsomol congress. What would the fraction of the CPSU in Lithuania do when they find themselves outside the constitution?

Following this, delegate Sergey Nagorny announces that he wants to make a statement on behalf of 130 congress delegates who voted against the fully independent Lithuanian Communist Party. He says these communists held a conference yesterday in Vilnius and will continue their conference. A decision was adopted by these delegates at the conference to further participate in the conference but to defy the voting.

Following this, several proposals are made concerning this statement: some said the mandates of these delegates should now be replaced by the mandates of guests only, others suggested these delegates should return the mandates altogether. Finally, the decision is reached that democratically this group has the right not to take part in the voting. They are asked to abstain from taking part in the discussion because the matter under discussion is no longer their concern; this would only impede the discussion and would be a waste of everyone's time.

At 0825 GMT, Vladimiras Beriozovas, second secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party, begins his report on the statute of the independent Lithuanian communist party. He points out only those items in the statute that were entirely new and that could not be found in the similar document of the CPSU, namely, that CPSU members could only be expelled from the party. Now, leaving the party or joining the party is based on a person's free will. It is also clearly stated that a communist party member has the right to freedom of conscience, i.e. to be a believer or an athiest. The next point is that principal party organizations in some cases may not comply with the wishes of the top administration of the party; this runs counter to the requirements of the democratic centralism stated in the CPSU rules. A concept of party sponsorship has been introduced, i.e. those who support the party. It is stated that the statute should include the requirement for discipline in the party; otherwise the party may become a club for discussion.

Discussions then continue on the issue of the editing commission of the statute. Several delegates protest that persons who voted against this statute and the independent communist party should not be included into the above commission. The discussion continues.

0848 GMT

LD2112100289

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0848 GMT on 21 December continues its live relay from Vilnius of the Lithuanian Communist Party congress.

The delegates discuss the composition of working committees. a decision is reached that the delegates who voted against an independent Lithuanian Communist Party will be allowed to be included in the commissions.

At 0931 GMT, the issue of a quorum is raised. The question is whether the quorum should be changed if 135 delegates decide to withdraw from voting.

At 0937 GMT, the debate on the composition of working committees is completed; other procedural matters are solved. A proposal is made to vote on the proposed composition of the statute editorial commission. The vote is taken; 764 vote in favor of the commission's composition.

At 0940 GMT the congress adjourns for 20 minutes.

1012 GMT

LD2112124989

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1012 GMT on 21 December resumes its live relay of the Lithuanian Communist Party [CP] congress proceedings.

A report by the Auditing Commission is announced. However, this decision is changed and the floor is then given to delegate Poskus, who makes the following remarks:

"Esteemed delegates: During the first sitting today we learned, and it was announced twice, that yesterday a separate conference was held by 135 delegates from this congress, during which an Organizational Bureau was elected. Appropriate documents were sent to Moscow and Leningrad.

"As we have understood, the members of the conference have appropriated the right to call themselves the 'Successors of the Lithuanian CP.' A certain legal collision has occurred which has to be solved with full seriousness and in an argumented way.

"I propose to entrust the Credentials Commission with the task of investigating this problem together with the representatives of the above Organisational Bureau as well as the representatives of the Central Committee and to present a corresponding draft decision to the congress.

"I would think that this work has to be completed today until the afternoon sitting. I propose to take a vote on this proposition."

Following this, a vote is taken; 809 delegates support the proposal.

At 1023 GMT a report of the Auditing Commission is read. The report focuses on financial matters of the party; figures and statistical data are given.

At 1040 GMT the main points in the report of the Auditing Commission are given: membership of the CP was declining; by 1 October 9,700 members of the CP had failed to pay their party membership fees. the speaker says that the money raised from party membership fees will decline by 35-40%. According to the speaker, 1,700 party staff workers will have to dismissed. He adds that redundancy compensation should be paid to them.

At 1042 GMT it is announced that 18 delegates have sent questions concerning the report. These will be answered in due course.

At 1047 GMT debates begn on the party statute. Delegates Mazunaitis, Irena Kasperaviciene from Klaipeda, Sigitas Damasiunas from Kaunas speak about specific paragraphs in the Statute. The draft copy of the statute has been given to each delegate.

At 1110 GMT reception deteriorates.

At 1130 GMT reception is restored. Debates on the statute are in progress. A speaker says that a clear cut party policy on agriculture has to be included in the party program.

At 1140 GMT Gediminas Dragunavicius from Kaunas takes the floor. He says that the form of ownership should be the basis of all program documents adopted by this congress. Forms on ownership of means of production and other property should be announced to the people today. He says the party must decare what it is going to change, because the draft documents do not indicate that anything will be changed. He says that dismantling the totalitarian system is the main task of the CP.

At 1143 GMT Romas Adamavicius, second secretary of the Marijampole party city committee, the comments on specific paragraphs of the statute. He opposes changing the party's name at the present moment. He also proposes to send a message to the CPSU CC and other republican parties explaining the decisions adopted by this Congress. This, according to the speaker, will prevent false descriptions of the intentions of this congress being made.

At 1150 GMT debates end. Other organizational questions are discussed.

At 1210 GMT the congress adjournes for lunch until 1400 GMT.

Latvian Court Rules on Local Elections

PM1912165489 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 50, 10 Dec 89 p 7

[Grant Gukasov report: "Latvia: The People Will Choose. Final Days Before Elections to the Local Soviets"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] December 10 will mark the beginning of a major political campaign in the USSR in anticipation of the 28th CPSU Congress. On that date elections to the local soviets (councils) will be held in the Latvian and Estonian Soviet Socialist Republics. The election campaign will vary from one Union Republic to another, depending on various local issues, yet its common features will reflect the general situation in the country at the current highly involved stage of perestroika. The pre-election situation in Latvia can throw light on the forthcoming campaign in general. Read this report from our special correspondent in Riga, the Latvian capital.

"In the name of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic," Judge Raimonds Gravelsinks of Riga's Oktybrskiy District read out the ruling, "this court binds the city electoral commission to register as electoral candidates the members of the 'Serviceman is human!' movement Raimonds Berzins and Yevgeniy Orlov. This judgement is final and not subjected to appeal."

"The electoral commission had arbitrarily interpreted the Law on Elections to local soviets recently passed by Latvia's Supreme Soviet," the judge commented on the court's decision. "The above candidates were told that their organization was not listed among Riga's non-governmental bodies, was too small, and so on. All those arguments being ungrounded according to the law, the people's court rejected them."

Was this the first case in your long-standing practice!

According to the social standards of the recent past, it is unprecedented. Today this ruling has already encouraged the city electoral commission to immediately revise 14 other protests to the mutual satisfaction of the parties...

Last March, 70 percent of Latvia's constituents voted for candidates from Latvia's Popular Front. Have the defeated official candidates learnt their lesson!

This question was addressed to Pavel Grabovik, chief of the ideological section of Riga's Party Committee. He said: "No doubt about that. We have been preparing for this coming election very seriously. On November 10, the City Party Committee adopted its electoral programme which contains almost no declarations, the emphasis being on concrete problems and the surest ways of resolving them. The City Party Committee has set up election HQ, and support groups within work collectives. Groups of Communists have been mobilized on housing estates. Their task is to reach every constituent, to show them graphically what the deputies are proposing to do to make the life of common people better. All our activists have copies of Riga's Communists' election program entitled 'For the Soviet Power in Sovereign Latvia'. Recommendations and memoranda have been issued to all candidates and their canvassers."

The following is a quote from recommendations for dialogue with electors:

"If the elector supporting candidates of Latvia's Popular Front who advocate Latvia's secession from the USSR challenges you to assess this policy in terms of your candidate's programme, don't try to openly convert him. Try to explain your negative attitude to such a policy with statements like this: 'Secession might make Latvia prosperous one day, on a par with countries, like Finland. But one should remember that it took those countries 30 to 60 years to reach their present standard of living. It is also clear that such serious steps will inevitably bring about a sharp deterioration in the country's economic situation accompanied by social upheavals. Look at what is happening in Poland. We are aiming for a high standard of living and a breakthrough in Latvia's economic and cultural development without running the risk of serious upheavals and having to tighten our belts for a long time. Rebuilding and refurbishing is always easier than scrapping something and starting again from scratch'. In other cases a still briefer formula may be applied: 'This idea is yet another version of "the radiant future", proposed by the new local functionaries (thus the idea discredits itself by discrediting its proponents). Our candidates are for "the radiant present."'"

I will not assess this or other documents written in the traditional style. I can only say that I sensed in my interviewee's voice an unfamiliar uncertainty, so unlike the previously unshakable confidence of forthcoming triumphs. My impressions were reinforced as I listened to Pavel Grabovik's conversations with a visitor in rugged overalls.

"I rang you up yesterday," the visitor said politely. "I'm Vladimir Naryshkin, a construction worker. In your recommendations here you run down Resolution No. 46 of the Council of Ministers, 'On Stopping the Mechanical Population increase (Migration)'. Had you been a Party of the proletariat, you would have readily perceived that the Resolution was passed in order to defend workers against cheap labor. But you are unable to understand this because you defend departmental interests. And these have always consisted in growing fat on underpaying the workers."

Pavel Grabovik nodded in agreement and hastened to add a few commonplaces. When Naryshkin left, Grabovik said to me: "We do not seek conflict with anyone. At present we ought to seek points of contact and produce a favourable impression on visitors.

One can hardly expect a different attitude from the Party officials at a time when the Communist Party of Latvia is experiencing sharp discord as evident from the following two documents:

"To the Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Latvia and the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee.

From Alfreds Rubiks, member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Latvia (Chairman of the Riga City Executive Committee - G. G.)

The Bureau of the Central Committee turns a deaf ear or takes an increasingly conciliatory stand with respect to Latvia's Popular Front and its leadership. Further passivity of the Bureau and other Latvian leaders in the given political situation is inadmissible and therefore I propose the following: the Party should give a principled assessment to the congress of Latvia's Popular Front without further delay; it should define the liabilities for its members who not only fail to meet the requirements of the CPSU Rules and Programme, but also pursue subversive tactics with regard to Soviet power under the guise of perestroika demagoguery,... who contribute to dissent in the Party, to a loosening of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and further complications in interethnic relations. After the local elections, it will be too late. Soviets (councils) will be set up on the platform of the Popular Front and the real power will pass from the Soviets to the Popular Front, while the Communist Party will either reduce or lose its chances of performing its leading and organizing functions."

Local Russian-language newspapers have published dozens of letters supporting the above statement, but here is what the appeal to the Communists of Latvia, signed by eight members of the Central Committee and 31 secretaries of local, city and primary Party committees, says:

"Can we Latvian Communists overcome our own mistakes and the resistance of the conservative forces so as to reform the Party and win real popular support instead of the ostentatious authority stipulated by law? In our opinion we shall be able to achieve this only if and when we orient the Party's activities towards tdhe interests of the people. We hereby propose the following fundamental premises: the Communist Party of Latvia stands for the priority of universal human values. The Communist Party is to become independent politically, organizationally and financially. We are ready to build our relations with the CPSU, the Communist Parties of other Union Republics and other parties on the basis of mutual respect and real partnership. The Communist Party of Latvia is to become an integral part of the political system of a parliamentarian Latvian state by renouncing the constitutionally guaranteed monopoly on Power. Relying on its historically established multinational membership, the Communist Party of Latvia ought to stand for consolidation within the Party and the society of people of different nationalities on the basis of universal human principles, equality and democracy. The Party must dispel the mood of instability and apathy."

"The Latvian Communist Party today reminds me of the Kalashnikov submachine gun I once handled," said Aleksandr Minin, chief of the information sector in the Riga City Party Committee. "It seemed a powerful weapon, but had no striker pin. Our social information agency, Socioniks, has conducted a poll on the more topical issues among both Russian- and Latvian-speaking people. The results are really striking. They show the massive reserves of the city Party organization, the apparent blunders of the Popular Front and the interfront. But our Party functionaries only know how to deal with gross output results, labour productivity and milk yield reports. They are not interested in our data. Instead of mobilizing all their reserves to work with the population, the City and District Party committees remain captives of industrial and department interests. They are just unable to transcend these."

Together with Aleksandr Minin we pushed along old Riga's narrow streets towards the Popular Front HQ. We spotted the place at a distance by the characteristic flag over the door. Not to confuse my interviewees, Aleksandr Minin did not disclose his identity while attentively following the arguments of the "other side." He had told me beforehand that the information would be very interesting for his agency and possibly essential to his clients.

"The phase of 'revolution from above' is over, we believe," said Janis Skapars, Chairman of the Board of the Popular Front ruling body. "Now the time has come for the revolution from below. The people have begun thinking with remarkable intensity. In all 14,557 constituencies there are Popular Front candidates or people we support. The Party leaders are profoundly mistaken when they say that the Popular Front is out to usurp power. They should know better than anyone that it is the people who are taking power into their own hands. But this is exactly what functionaries fear most. We are now working among the Russian-speaking population through a highly qualifiied group of lecturers..."

"As a result, more than 400,000 non-Latvians are supporting Popular Front candidates," adds I. Calitis, in charge of public relations with democratic organizations, member of the Popular Front ruling body. "The Interfront has lots of generals, but only a few soldiers left. For six months now they have been unable to rally more than 4,000 people for a meeting. It is not the leaders, but their ideologdy that is to blame. The national (ethnic) issue is trivial enough. It is the Law on Economic Independence of the Baltic Republics recently adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet that matters. It is a great responsibility for us, but we are not afraid of the risk. On December 10, people will decide where and how we proceed from here."

Minin and I came out onto a noisy street and after a long wait squeezed ourselves onto Tram No. 6.

"Incidentally, I met Skapars a short time ago at the Bureau of the City Party Committee," Minin said. And suddenly added, in terror: "Revolution from below, my foot! And this is a Communist speaking!"

I say, by way of reply, that this seems perfectly all right by today's standards. Nobody looks round at us. In the last two years or so the people of Riga have been talking politics to the exclusion of almost everything else.

Latvian KGB Confiscates 'Arsenal'

PM2012120189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 16 Dec 89 Second Edition p 6

[TASS correspondent V. Zaytsev report: "'Schmeisser'—Argument for Democracy?"]

[Text] Riga—Thirteen turned out to be an unlucky number for Yanis Millers and Viktor Pashkevits—inhabitants of Tukumskiy Rayon in Latvia. Late in the evening of 13 December they were detained by Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] KGB staffers.

When they were searched, the following was discovered on them: two submachineguns—a "Schmeisser" and a Degtyarev submachinegun, two pistols, including a Browning with a full clip of ammunition, antitank and antipersonnel mines, various components of small-arms weapons, over 1,000 live cartridges, and detonators for bombs and projectiles, and explosives... Thirty-year-old Ya. Millers, who was working as a guard, was also found to possess a handwritten manual on munitions.

An explanation is necessary here—the "collectors" were exposed by security officers during the investigation which the Latvian SSR Prosecutor's Office is carrying out into the case of Leo Khirshsons. In late November 34-year-old L. Khirshsons, Latvian Social-Democratic Workers' Party member and activist, was detained for illegal possession of weapons. Admittedly, his arsenal was rather smaller, whereas here, when the mines were confiscated, the assistance of military engineers was needed in order not to endanger people's lives.

Without going into the question of Ya. Millers' and V. Pashkevits's party affiliations, I will note that they were close friends of L. Khirshsons—this was said at a meeting yesterday with journalists at the Latvian SSR KGB. Here we saw almost all of the "arsenal."

The investigation into the case is continuing, but it can already be said that the arguments of L. Khirshsons and his like that they needed such a quantity of weapons to protect themselves from burglars or for their collection can scarcely convince anyone. Such a quantity of explosives could have blown sky-high the whole farm where they were being kept...

According to Ya. Trubinsh, deputy chairman of the Latvian SSR KGB, security officers and Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] organs have already seized 300 combat weapons and 500 unregistered hunting weapons.

All organizations, both radical and otherwise, that advocate Latvia's sovereignty and autonomy stress that they are moving toward these goals along a nonviolent democratic path. But the chronicle of the past few days indicates something else: On 8 December in Riga a home-made bomb was thrown at a vehicle full of servicemen which was passing through a group of young people. One of the servicemen was wounded by the explosion and is in hospital. On 9 December an attack was carried out on a sentry at a military unit. The attacker stunned the guard by striking him on the head with an ax and stole his assault rifle and 60 cartridges.

These incidents are forcing the state security organs and the republic MVD to be more careful about cases of illegal possession of firearms and explosives.

Results of Estonian 10 Dec Local Elections

LD1812232989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2100 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] The results have become known for elections to local soviets in Estonia, which took place on 10 December. For the first time they were conducted in accordance with the law adopted in August. Multimandate districts were formed in a number of towns and rayons. The overall number of people who did not take part in the elections exceeds 30,000. Of these a little less than half is attributable to Tallinn where in four districts elections, for all intents and purposes, did not take place. Less than 50 percent of registered voters came to polling stations. Elections also did not take place in three districts in Maardu, a satellite town of Tallinn. Elections failed to take place in areas of a predominantly Russian-speaking population. It can to some extent also be seen as a boycott which was called for by leaders of Interdvizheniye [Intermovement] and of the joint personnel of Estonia's labor collectives. The reason is the qualification by (?settlement) envisaged by the law on elections to local soviets. In accordance with the law, additional elections should take place on 27 January.

Estonian Deputies Comment on Draft Press Law

90US0289B Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 26 Nov 89 p 3

[Report on interview with Estonian People's Deputies M. Lauristin and T. Pupkevich, by S. Vagin, SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA special correspondent in Moscow: "Will There Be a Free Press?"; first three paragraphs are SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA introduction; date not given]

[Text] It seems to me the situation at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet is becoming more and more tense. Hot debate is underway not only in the meeting hall, but in the foyers, snack bars, and smoking lounges as well. The deputies are disputing matters of citizenship, language, leasing, the ecology... Many of the draft laws have been returned to commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet for more work and finalizing, and it is not known whether they will be adopted at the present session. All of this is causing the deputies alarm—the voters are demanding they make definite decisions.

To a certain extent oil was poured on the fire by the draft Law "On the Press and Other Mass Media," introduced by the Committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet on Matters of Glasnost, Rights and Appeals of Citizens. The fact is that its new version, recently distributed to the people's deputies, has expanded and clarified many articles, but there are some in which the rights of journalists are treated ambiguously—the text may be interpreted in a variety of ways. For example, I had occasion to hear the following assertions: that the proposed draft law does not provide complete freedom of the press, and the opposite view as well—that if the draft law is adopted, the press will be removed from the control of party and administrative apparatus, and then...

What do the USSR people's deputies from our republic think about this? I asked M. Lauristin and T. Pupkevich to comment on the draft Law "On the Press and Other Mass Media."

Lauristin: Finally we are close to the emergence of a law on the press. I have attentively read through the proposed draft and my appraisal is positive on the whole. Many of the ideas contained in this document show great similarity to problems we in Estonia have long since been working on.

There is something important here, without which the activity of our modern press is inconceivable—the repeal of censorship of the mass media and repudiation of monopolization of newspapers, radio, television, and other mass media by state and party organs. This is the foundation, the basis for complete freedom in journalism.

Article 6 is very important, in my view, which states that the right to establish a mass medium belongs to state and social organizations, creative unions, religious, cooperative, and other associations of citizens instituted in accordance with the law, and also to labor collectives and citizens of the USSR. There are no political restrictions in the registration of these publications media, and what restrictions there are are entirely reasonable.

Of course, there are points in the draft which arouse uncertainty, which provide cause for a variety of interpretations. Thus, in Article 5 it is stated: "...use of the mass media is not permitted to...call for the violent overthrow or change of the existing state and social order." Pay attention to the second half of this sentence, beginning with the word "change." In that case, the entirety of perestroyka is placed outside the law?! Or consider this. The same article refers to religious exclusivity not being allowed. What does this mean? Again we could interpret it this way and that. Such imprecision in wording can lead to undemocratic activity.

Some of our legal experts have raised the question as to who is responsible if a state secret is revealed in the press or some other organ—the journalist or the person who provided the information? As we know, a correspondent is simply in no position to thoroughly investigate every sphere of industry and science, etc., and the draft law makes it possible to lay all the blame for revealing a secret squarely on him. The deputies have something to argue about here.

I think there will also be quarrels at the session on the rights of journalists. These were delineated more precisely in the first version of the draft law. Now they are vague and ambiguous. We should not forget that the correspondent is a representative of the people's rights to objective, truthful information. In general, the draft law gives the right to information, but later on the text falls short and fails to decode what this right consists of.

Article 35, which mentions the right of the journalist, is noteworthy. Point 6, for example, states: "...a journalist has the right to refuse to prepare material contradictory to his convictions." This is stated for the first time. Finally a correspondent has obtained the right to write those things about which he has deep convictions. He is not just a cog in the political process, but becomes a political figure. We are moving away from the idea that a journalist is just a representative of one organ or another, devoid of his own point of view. And this is good. We used to say that they at the top would use the press to push through their line; now the press has obtained the right to its own line. We see the opportunity of establishing editorial collectives of people who share the same views.

I would like to state something else. In general, the draft law presented to us is a step which moves the press away from being a tool of the authorities and toward the people, toward the development of democracy and glasnost. We will be achieving its adoption very soon.

Pupkevich: Before offering my comments on the draft law proposed to us "On the Press and Other Mass Media," I would like to say a few words about our current press. I have a dual attitude toward it. On the one hand, it issues a great deal of interesting historical information and critical articles, but they are all monotonous. Our past is presented exclusively in a dark light. Attention is focused only on deficiencies. Personal ambitions stand out. Sensationalism is pursued. This decreases interest in the press to some degree. How much can you say about Stalinism and the period of stagnation? We must not keep the deceased in our house so long. Yes, we must remember and pay what is due—but life goes on, and it requires constructive resolution of the political, economic, ethnic, and other issues which are taking tremendous amounts of energy away from the people. Journalists must not forget that it is not only the past that troubles people, but their daily bread as well. Our press owes something to the readership in this regard. You seldom find an article containing an analysis of the situation today in our republic, in our country. And you seldom hear a word from experienced people with regard to how we can tie in new ideas with actuality so they do not become another chimera.

Nor does our republic press entirely satisfy me. We have all become enamored with politics. We see one model, then another presented for the development of society, but no one gives any understanding as to how they can be implemented. Here in the USSR Supreme Soviet unhurried attempts are being made to resolve them, to delve deeply into the essence of these problems. Of course the laws we have adopted will not immediately be effective—this will take time. But at least they will begin to respond to people's interests.

Vagin: It seems to me these claims will not exist if the Law "On the Press and Other Mass Media" goes into effect. By the way, how do you feel about the repeal of censorship?

Pupkevich: One thing I know: If we are striving to attain a law-governed state, then any human rights, regardless of their particular nature, should be satisfied. But we must remember that freedom of the press presupposes a high responsibility for what is stated. The matter of forming public opinion without censorship is a new phenomenon for us. A journalist will gain access to the most diverse information and will be able to disseminate it. But if personal interests start getting involved in it... The law should bring the rights and obligations of the press into conformance with each other.

And here we see it stated in the draft law that USSR citizens are extended the right to institute a mass media instrument. We do have people with sufficient funds to issue their own publication. But let me say once again, there must be responsibility as well—for the published word can be used in a variety of ways. A person can have good intentions which are not directed toward pursuit of the truth. It is intolerable for political groups to go beyond the limits of propriety (which we have seen already). And the law must have its say here. But one should notice that the draft law here under discussion states precisely that neither the party nor the administration is to decide a situational conflict—only the courts. And this is proper.

Vagin: How do you feel about Point 4 of Article 33, which states: "Information concerning the private life of a citizen may not be divulged without his consent, unless such information is of social significance"?

Pupkevich: We see instances today where certain journalists exhibit unscrupulousness. A correspondent's personal interests can enable the press to raise an individual to the skies or throw him into the dirt. It is only just to protect the individual from interference into his personal life. But how then are we to interpret the words "unless...of social significance"? If a person has committed a crime, for example, and the newspaper publishes material for educational purposes, warning of the mistakes of others—is this of social significance or not? We have something to think about here in discussing the draft law. It is a different question when you have a matter dealing with state or party figures, with Gorbachev or Ryzhkov. Their lives are far beyond the framework of being a personal matter. The Americans say their president is also a person, but he should be somewhat better. Unfortunately, we still know very little about the personal life of our leaders—then too our press has no experience in relating this. But I will stress that when they do write about such people, they must show their personal lives from a moral orientation, from a standpoint of principles common to all mankind.

A final comment. I am satisfied, on the whole, with the draft law (there will be corrections, of course). Here in Estonia, for example, we do not always take into account the opinion of the Russian-speaking population. There are few publications in Russian. The Law on the Press will help correct this.

Gidaspov Comments on Leningrad Political Situation

90UN0484A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Dec 89 First Edition p 3

[Report by Col V. Streltsov and Capt 1st Rank A. Zlydnev: "Consolidation or Confrontation?"]

[Text] Leningrad, 7 December—This remained an open question for many of the participants in a city-wide mass meeting held in the city on the Neva.

The familiar square in front of the V.I. Lenin Sports-Concert Complex. Intensity of passions has become a hallmark of our complex times... Communists and nonparty people and representatives of various public democratic formations of the city came here yesterday evening to state their position in perestroyka and their attitude toward the processes which are occurring in our country.

As a whole, considering the inevitable costs of mass-meeting spontaneity, the discussion was a success. Suffice it to say that the majority of speakers did not descend, as has been the case previously at such gatherings, to sweeping vituperation and pseudo-revolutionary rhetoric. Although it should be said, for the sake of objectivity, that far from all the speeches and slogans were distinguished by propriety.

But however great the intensity of passions, the greatest sympathy among those assembled was elicited by the speeches which contained a constructive basis and which called for unity of forces in the name of the speediest recovery of the situation in the country and the consolidation of its economic and political stability.

"We do not need confrontation, enough of fomenting passions," USSR People's Deputy V. Petropavlovskiy said from the meeting platform. "The enemy image has never brought positive results."

Full support for this proposition was also heard in the speech of G. Bogomolov, a milling machine operator of the "Lenpoligrafmash" Association and a leader of the Leningrad People's Front.

It was notable that not only the so-called informals but also the representatives of Leningrad's party and soviet authorities and USSR People's Deputies Yu. Boldyrev, B. Gidaspov, A. Obolenskiy and A. Shchelkanov took part in the serious discussion of urgent problems.

The resolution of the meeting said, inter alia: "We Leningrad communists and nonparty participants in the meeting declare our support for the policy of radical political and economic reforms. We welcome the endeavor of M.S. Gorbachev and his supporters in the party leadership to impart to our society a humane character and restore the country to the channel of general civilization. While sharing the just criticism of the communists leveled at the CPSU Central Committee for slowness and inconsistency in the implementation of the reforms, we believe that no less responsibility for the catastrophic state of affairs in Leningrad is borne by the Leningrad Obkom and Gorkom [oblast and city party committees]."

Even before this resolution was read out, we asked B. Gidaspov, first secretary of the Leningrad Obkom and Gorkom:

"You are the first Leningrad party leader to participate in a meeting of the informals. What brought you here? What are your impressions from what you have seen and heard?"

"I came to the meeting on my own initiative. I believe that it is time for all of us party and soviet leaders to finally leave the smoke-filled offices and conduct a dialogue with the people directly. For the first time in recent years all democratic forces have come to the same place with their banners and slogans. And even if on this occasion a constructive discussion in the full sense did not result, the fact that we stood next to and listened to one another—this was a considerable success. After all, we shall not get to the truth without such communication. I will say plainly that I was not impressed by everything. Yes, I heard the shouts: 'Gidaspov, resign!' and saw a placard with the words 'Sobchak Is With the People, Who Is Gidaspov With?' Believe me, this shocked me. In such a situation everyone should have an opportunity to speak openly, without dissembling, this is what democracy means."

...So was the meeting marked by consolidation or confrontation? No caterogical answer to this question is possible. For confrontation is an obvious thing. But it is sometimes a difficult path toward unity. Very well, in this case let us consider the first step toward mutual understanding taken.

Leningrad Joint Plenum Issues Resolution

90UN0434A Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 29 Nov 89 p 1

[Resolution of a joint plenum of the Leningrad Obkom and Gorkom on 21 November 1989: "Concerning the Platform of the Leningrad Party Organization Under Current Conditions"]

[Text] The joint plenum observes that discussion of the draft action program of the Leningrad party organization under the conditions of perestroyka in the party, soviet and public organizations has contributed to the stimulation of the communists in formulation of the ways to enhance the party's role in society and renew it and further extend the democratization of intra-party life.

In the course of the discussion the communists, working people and inhabitants of Leningrad and the oblast made specific observations pertaining to a restructuring of the style and methods of work of the party committees and primary organizations and proposed constructive approaches to the accomplishment of urgent tasks. They spoke with concern about the continuing decline in labor and peformance discipline and the responsibility of the personnel, the growth of crime, breakdowns in the provision of the population with food and industrial commodities, the spreading profiteering in the cooperative movement, the reduction in the living standard of needy citizens and the deepening of people's material stratification. Dissatisfaction is being expressed at party meetings at the position of the communists who are working in soviet establishments and are failing to seek the eradication of bureaucratism, red tape and slowness in the solution of serious questions of the life of Leningraders and also the communists who, operating in the media, and permitting the portrayal in biased and frequently distorted form of the party's role and place in history, the foundations and principles of socialism and its humanitarian ideals and the prospects of the country's development. A growth in the discrepancy between word and deed and the extensive spread of various demagogic slogans and appeals is being noted.

Many party committees and primary party organizations have been unable to adopt a precise position in the removal of these negative phenomena.

The joint plenum observes also that the CPSU Central Committee is unjustifiably putting off the determination of its position on a number of acute questions of the theory and practice of socialism and the state of affairs in society and the party under the conditions of perestroyka.

Collating the numerous proposals of the working people and the inhabitants of the Leningrad region, the joint plenum of the obkom [oblast party committee] and Leningrad Gorkom [city party committee] resolves:

1. To confirm the platform of the Leningrad party organization under current conditions.

To instruct the editorial commission to make the appropriate corrections to the wording of the platform with regard for the debate conducted at the joint plenum and to publish it in the press.

To consider it necessary in the course of preparation for the 28th CPSU Congress and the elections of people's deputies of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and the local soviets for the gorkoms and raykoms [rayon party committees] to concentrate their efforts in their practical activity on the practical realization of the platform of the Leningrad party organization.

For each primary party organization to determine the tactics, forms and methods of achievement of the set goals and the participation of all communists, those working in soviet, trade union, Komsomol [Leninist Communist Youth League] and economic authorities and public formations included, in realization of the platform.

With regard for its propositions to organize precongress discussion of the CPSU Rules and the political platform of the CPSU Central Committee and also of the proposals pertaining to changes in the USSR Constitution. To instruct the commissions of the obkom and Leningrad Gorkom to make a systematic analysis of the proposals and observations received in the course of the discussion, with its results being conveyed to the primary party organizations and the CPSU Central Committee.

2. Considering Leningrad communists' numerous proposals, to deem it necessary to submit a proposal to the CPSU Central Committee on the organization prior to the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies of a special enlarged Central Committee plenum which would examine the position of the Central Committee Politburo in respect of the situation taking shape in the party and the state and also confirm the platform of the CPSU for the elections of people's deputies to the republic and local soviets and the standing orders of preparation of the CPSU congress.

3. To instruct the bureau of the obkom and Leningrad Gorkom in conjunction with the commissions for organizational-party and cadre work to prepare and submit proposals concerning the structure of the obkom and gorkom machinery with regard for the decisions adopted by this plenum.

4. The editorial offices of Leningrad newspapers and journals and the Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting to particiate actively and constructively in ensuring fulfillment of the platform of the Leningrad party organization under current conditions and the extensive portrayal of the experience of this important work.

Leningrad Communist Party Platform Published

90UN0434B Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 29 Nov 89 pp 1, 2

[Platform of the Leningrad Party Organization Under Current Conditions]

[Text] Recognizing the entire extent of its historical responsibility for the socioeconomic and political crisis being experienced by the country and society, the CPSU began perestroyka under the conditions of the intensifying contradictions of social life, when it had become obvious that the model of socialism distorted under the influence of Stalinism was not in keeping with current realities. Leningrad's communists have emphatically broken with Stalinism and the administrative-command system which it engendered and will firmly uphold the democratic path of the renewal of socialism.

We see as the practical realization of the CPSU's strategic line the immediate elaboration of a new concept of socialism. This is the most important task of the 28th CPSU Congress, the date of which should be brought forward as much as possible. Leningraders—communists and nonparty people—are profoundly concerned that the crisis not only has not stopped but is continuing to intensify. Both at the center and locally incompetent, half-baked and, times, wrong decisions are frequently being adopted. Growing inflation is lowering the population's living standard, crime, organized included, is growing, performance and labor discipline has deteriorated and problems of interethnic relations, the ecology and culture have become aggravated. Dissatisfaction and anxiety over the fate of the country and socialism have come to predominate in the public consciousness.

All these processes have been manifested in Leningrad and the oblast. The rate of development of the economy has slowed in 1989. Fewer industrial consumer goods than planned were manufactured, and the production of many types of foodstuffs continues to decline. Wages are growing more rapidly than productivity, which has exacerbated the shortage on the goods and services market.

The "Housing 2000" program is being fulfilled unsatisfactorily. There have been no appreciable changes in health care, state trade, public catering and consumer services.

The complex economic and domestic political situation and the mistakes and miscalculations made in various years by the party leadership have been reflected in the authority of the CPSU and have engendered in part of the population doubts as to its capacity for being society's vanguard force.

The policy of democratization of the party determined by the 19th All-Union Party Conference is being implemented slowly and inconsistently. The administrative-command style of leadership persists in relations between the higher and lower party authorities and between the party committees and primary organizations. The elective party authorities frequently do not aspire to assertive activity, shifting responsibility onto the apparatus. Disturbing trends are being observed in the CPSU, the number of those leaving the party is growing, and enrollment is declining. There is an increasing mood of confusion among the communists, and some party organizations are in practice losing the initiative. In this situation forces entering into confrontation with the CPSU and aspiring to a destabilization of the political situation, which is creating a threat to the democratic way out of the crisis, have in this situation come onto the political scene. A desire to turn back, to the old forms of the organization of society and party leadership, is arising among some communists. This is a dangerous tendency. On the other hand, it is impossible not have to share the growing understanding of the inevitability of changes in the party and a cardinal renewal of its role in society.

Taking the results of the extensive discussion by the communists and all Leningraders of the situation in the party and the country as a basis, the Leningrad party organization deems it necessary to define as follows the program of its actions under current conditions.

In the Sphere of Policy and Ideology

1. Born as a party of the working class and being its party in terms of class essence and ideology, the CPSU has always aspired to the unification of all working people around socialist ideals. While preserving the continuity of the aims of the workers movement, it has in the process of development of the Soviet society become a party of all working people. Today the party aspires to be the political vanguard of society, to express and champion the fundamental interests of the whole Soviet people, act as the consolidating factor of the progressive forces on a socialist basis, democratically formulate the strategy of the country's development and implement it via the communists.

The ideological basis of the party was and remains creative Marxism-Leninism.

2. Present-day socialism as we understand it is a society of free labor, social justice and democracy, in which the main value is man.

Socialism as we understand it should be characterized by:

- an efficient and dynamic economy, the basis of which is public ownership with a diversity of forms of its realization, given the existence of other forms of ownership not based on the exploitation of wage labor;
- the organic combination of planning with developed commodity-money relationships;
- a developed ecological culture and the harmonization of the relations of society and nature;
- a high level of public well-being and the maximum

social protection of the working people, given consistent implementation of the principle of distribution according to labor and the eradication of all forms of wage-leveling and social parasitism;
- relations of genuine equality, fraternity and friendship between peoples and the dialectical combination therein of the principles of socialist patriotism, national pride and internationalism;
- the democratic organization of the political power of the working people based on legality and self-management;
- genuine humanism and the manifestation of all the creative capabilities of the individual and the free development of each as a condition of the free development of all;
- high culture and morals inheriting and multiplying the best achievements of mankind's spiritual development;
- a love of peace, respect for the social choice of other peoples and civilized relations between states;
- a dialectical combination of interests common to all mankind and class interests, given the priority of values common to all mankind.

3. The Leningrad party organization sees a serious danger in the attempts to deny Marxism-Leninism as a creative teaching and belittle the significance of the Great October, the tendentious illustration of the life and activity of V.I. Lenin, the indiscriminate censuring of the historical path of the Soviet people and the disregard for their revolutionary, combat and labor traditions. A most important task of the party is propaganda of the ideas of V.I. Lenin and study and creative development, without dogmatism and cliches, of his theoretical legacy. A truthful and honest portrayal, without embellishment and without distortions, of the complex socialist development of our country and the inculcation on the basis of the ideological values of revolutionary restructuring of Soviet patriotism, without which the socioeconomic and spiritual revival of society and Leningrad is impossible, are essential.

4. Leningrad's communists believe that under the new conditions the plenitude of state power should be concentrated in the soviets of people's deputies and are opposed to the party authorities substituting for the state authorities and advocate political and economic guarantees of the soviets' performance of the functions of public self-management.

Having weighed all the pros and cons, the majority of communists support the holding of direct elections of people's deputies, given secret balloting by territorial okrug.

5. While not rejecting political pluralism, a multiparty system included, as a principle of the organization of the socialist political system, Leningrad's communists advocate a specific-historical approach in its implementation and the acceleration of the elaboration and enactment of a law on parties and public organizations.

We believe that the Communist Party has no need of legal enshrinement of its leading role. The CPSU's authority is not an inheritance passing from one generation to another but a goal, whose achievement requires the daily, painstaking labor of all communists.

6. In implementing its policy in respect of the unions the Leningrad party organization proceeds from the fact that this is an independent mass public organization called on to defend the interests of the working people, avert labor conflicts on the shopfloor and prevent group egotism and the solution of the problems of some categories of working people at the expense of others. It is essential to pursue this policy via the communists, primarily those elected to the union bodies, by way of the rendering to them of the utmost assistance in the formulation of action strategy and tactics.

7. We advocate a strengthening of the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] as an independent youth organization supporting a common political platform with the CPSU. The communists build their relations with it on the basis of close practical interaction without interference in internal affairs and are seeking new ways of influencing the youth movement.

8. We support all public movements advocating the party's policy of perestroyka and the renewal of society on a socialist basis. We advocate cooperation with these movements in the implementation of economic and political reforms and the formation of organs of soviet power. At the same time the Leningrad party organization is emphatically opposed to extremist manifestations in the activity of a number of organizations, including the most popular—the Leningrad People's Front and the United Workers Front—threatening a destabilization of the political situation in the region. Preventing the development of a confrontational frame of mind and actively contributing to consolidation on the platform of perestroyka is the duty and obligation of each communist. Communists' participation in the activity of anti-Soviet, nationalist organizations is incompatible with CPSU membership.

9. Leningrad communists' attitude toward nationality problems is constructed on the basis of the equality, freedom and political and cultural self-determination of the nations and internationalist principles of relations between them. We support the trend toward the development and strengthening of the USSR on the principles of the federative system and advocate the accelerated scientific study of updated treaty principles of the unification of the peoples of the USSR in a common state. The economic, sociopolitical and cultural problems of the development of Russia, on which the prospects of the development of the entire Soviet federation depend to a considerable extent, are important.

Leningrad is not shielded against general nationality problems. The creation of national-cultural centers, the organization of national schools and cultural establishments and the publication of the corresponding periodical publications and literature, granted all their significance for satisfaction of the interests of national groups, should not lead to their exclusiveness and estrangement. The Leningrad House of Friendship of Peoples of the USSR should be a center of patriotic and international education.

10. The Leningrad party organization advocates the openness of all sources of information which are not an official secret and the extensive briefing of the population on the most serious problems, primarily on questions of the production and distribution of material benefits, social justice, the ecology and housing construction and the fight against crime, in order that Leningraders might know which problems may be solved currently and which in the future, who is responsible for their solution and who is impeding matters.

Plans concerning the interests of all Leningraders should be adopted only after public expert appraisal and, where necessary, a referendum.

It is the duty of each party committee to systematically study public opinion and take it into consideration in the formulation and implementation of its policy.

11. A reality of social and political life in the period of perestroyka has been the diversity of views and opinions. While supporting the expansion thereof and recognizing the right of everyone to freedom of belief and rejecting the administrative suppression of dissidence, communists should oppose the propaganda of war and violence, nationalism and chauvinism, atheistic and religious intolerance, amoralism and other inhumane views.

There is a considerable increase under the new conditions in the role of the party's ideological work. A serious restructuring of the system of party-political education and agitation-mass activity is needed. Particular significance is attached to ideological work at the place of residence.

It is necessary to restore and create lecturer groups in the gorkoms and raykoms [city and rayon party committees].

12. The Leningrad party committees will organize their work with the media on the basis of strict observance of the USSR Constitution, international enactments recognized by the country and USSR laws ensuring citizens' democratic rights, including freedom of speech and the press. At the same time we consider it necessary to enhance the responsibility of journalists, of communists primarily, working in the media for propounding the policy line of the renewal of socialism and objectivity, adherence to principle and constructiveness in illustration of the processes of social life and to continue work on the broadening of the rights and independence of the editorial teams and public participation in their activity.

For the purpose of elimination of the monopolism of leadership of the press it is necessary to revise the structure of the media in Leningrad and the oblast and bring it into line with social and political requirements. Provide for the separation of the joint publications of party and soviet authorities and the organization of a regional newspaper of the soviets of people's deputies and strive for the speediest resumption of the journal LENINGRAD, the development of a cable television system and the organization of a public television channel. Support efforts pertaining to the opening of new newspapers: of the rayons, artistic unions and the trade unions. Embark as of 1 January 1990 on the publication of a news bulletin of the Leningrad party organization. Impart to DIALOG, the journal of the ideology departments of the Leningrad Obkom and Gorkom, the status of social and political publication.

13. We consider a priority task of all party organizations and committees the utmost preservation and development of Leningrad's spiritual culture via public initiative and educational movements aimed at the humanization of society and improvement of Leningraders' way of life.

Communists support in every possible way the diversity of creative quest based on the criteria of truth, artistic merit and professionalism contributing to the preservation and development of domestic and world cultural traditions and the principle of freedom of creativity and advocate the inseparable connection of art and the people and their ideals and moral standpoints.

Considering the all-union and world significance of the cultural objects in Leningrad and the oblast, it is necessary to seek an increase in appropriations for their development from state sources and an acceleration of transition to a public-state form of self-management in the field of culture.

The adoption of a special state program of the protection and development of Leningrad's cultural-historical complex, an increase in the role of the local budget in the financing of cultural development and the use of new economic opportunities, including joint ventures, for the strengthening and development of the physical plant of cultural establishments are essential. The use of commercial principles in culture should not run counter to its moral mission.

Participation in the restoration of historical objects of the city and oblast is the patriotic duty of communists and all Leningraders. We support the initiative of the public concerning the creation of a special fund in connection with the preparations for the celebration of our city's tricentennial.

14. Leningrad's communists believe that Leningrad's spiritual enrichment is impossible without cardinal changes in the sphere of public education. The region's educational potential makes it possible to put on the agenda the task of the formation in the period up to 1995 of a territorial system of continuous education. The way toward this is the formation of a public-state system of

education based on the principles of decentralization of the administration of educational institutions and their increased independence. A search for forms of the educational process which contribute to the all-around development of the youth's creative potential, the enrichment of its spiritual life, the inculcation of patriotism and love of the motherland and labor and a revival of the traditions of collectivism, mutual assistance, philanthropy, a feeling of charity and pride in one's city is essential. An important task is orienting public opinion toward the increased responsibility of the family for children's education and comprehensive assistance to the children's homes. The Leningrad party organization initiated the elaboration of the regional "Childhood" program.

We consider essential the organization in 1990 of an all-union meeting of innovator-teachers for the purpose of an analysis of the progress of the reform of the schools and clarification of the basic directions of its further development.

15. The efforts of the communists working in the courthouse, the procuracy, the police and judicial bodies, the workforce councils, people's control and the union and Komsomol organizations should be geared to an abrupt change for the better in the day-to-day situation in Leningrad and the oblast. It is essential with communists' personal participation to render the temporary committees for combating crime and abuses in the state and cooperative sectors of trade and in services full support.

Communists advocate the internal affairs authorities being rendered real assistance in the solution of social questions, provision with equipment and personnel reinforcement. They deem it essential to elaborate new statutory documents of the volunteer public order squads, these being extensively discussed in the workforce.

16. While supporting the assured defense of the country at the level of a reasonable sufficiency and recognizing in this connection the need for fundamental restructuring in the army, we consider impermissible the disparagement of its role in the socialist society. It is essential to adopt measures to enhance the prestige of army service, strengthen sponsorship ties to the military units and subunits, make more extensive use of their possibilities for the patriotic and civic education of the youth and its preparation for service in the USSR Armed Forces, display concrete concern for the housing and everyday conditions for servicemen, army and navy veterans and internationalist soldiers and contribute to their social protection, preserve the heroic traditions of the people and inculcate by all ideological means in the younger generation a sense of military duty. To make active use to this end of the preparations for commemoration of the 45th anniversary of the victory in the Great Patriotic War.

17. Political leadership under the new conditions is impossible without the scientific analysis and forecasting of social processes, which presupposes a strengthening of the party committees' ties to social scientists, a considerable improvement in the special scientific training of party officials and active use of the data of sociological and political science research.

We support the initiative of the party organization of Leningrad State University's Philosophy Faculty concerning the creation based on the university of the Center for the Elaboration of a Modern Concept of Socialism.

18. For the purpose of preparation for the 28th CPSU Congress and determination of the position of the Leningrad party organization there is an urgent need for the stimulation of debate on ways to renew socialism and the party, having preliminarily elaborated propositions pertaining to the following basic issues:

- the historical path of the CPSU and its contributions and miscalculations in socialist building;
- paths of the development of Marxism-Leninism as the theoretical basis of the CPSU;
- the modern concept of socialism;
- perestroyka and problems of the communist outlook;
- the place and role of the Marxist-Leninist party in the political system of the socialist society;
- political pluralism under socialism: its forms and methods of implementation;
- Leninist principles of the organizational structuring of the party: continuity and renewal under current conditions;
- the essence and content of political methods of party leadership;
- the national and international in socialist building;
- the dialectical combination of interests common to all mankind and class interests.

In the Sphere of Democratization of Intra-Party Life

The absence of an integral, scientific concept of renewal of the party is holding back the restructuring of the work of all its components and impeding the process of society's renewal. Leningrad's communists deem essential the elaboration of new CPSU statutes and a program.

A most important task in this process is the removal of the deformations associated with the distortion of the principle of democratic centralism, which at a particular stage of history was replaced by bureaucratic centralism. It is essential to revive the Leninist understanding of the principles of democratic centralism and afford the primary party organizations and every communist an opportunity to influence the content of party activity.

The entire process of the preparation, formulation and adoption of a decision and the progress of its implementation should be public and monitored by the party organizations and the communists.

Policy is implemented via people. It is essential to take cardinal steps in the direction of a decentralization of cadre work by way of the delegation of substantial powers in the solution of personnel questions from the top downward—from the higher to the lower party committees—and to make them equal subjects of cadre policy.

Democratization should permeate all intra-party life on the basis of dialectical unity with centralism and party discipline.

1. Guided by the principle of democratic centralism, we advocate the complete freedom of discussion up to the adoption of decisions, unity of action and personal responsibility for its realization at all levels and consideration of the opinion of the minority when it submits supporting reports and alternative draft resolutions. The communist has a right to publicly defend his viewpoint even in the event of its nonconcurrence with the decision adopted by the majority, if it is not contrary to the CPSU Program and Statutes.

Every communist is afforded an opportunity to familiarize himself with the stenographic accounts and other documents of the party authorities.

2. It is essential to impart a more democratic nature to the interaction of the party and economic authorities and make more persistent and purposive use of methods of persuasion here. To regard the party organizations' right of supervision of management activity as an increase in the responsibility of the communists working in administrative and management positions and in state and people's control bodies for the implementation of party decisions in the workforce. To proceed from the principle of the responsibility of members of the CPSU—to the state and the party.

3. To practice the annual rendering of account by the bureaus of raykoms, gorkoms and the obkom at party committee plenums, and of members of elective party bodies, at meetings of the party organizations in which they are registered and at which, if need be, the question of their recall from the higher party committee may be raised. Senior officials of the apparatus of the party committee to regularly render account concerning their work at its sessions and at party meetings.

To extend the practice of such accounts by members of the CPSU who have been elected people's deputies and to the executive bodies of public organizations.

The obkom and the gorkoms and raykoms will notify communists of the measures adopted in respect of their proposals and observations.

4. For the party organizations in the period of preparation for the report and election meetings and conferences and the 28th CPSU Congress to perform work on strengthening the unity of their ranks. To scrupulously examine communists' attitude toward compliance with the CPSU Statutes and Program and the tasks of perestroyka and to dispense with morally impure people who have compromised themselves.

5. Leningrad's communists consider it essential to abolish the party schedule approach when deciding personnel matters. To formulate an integral scientifically substantiated mechanism of the realization of cadre policy, having secured the necessary party influence via a system of the training of cadres and a reserve and direct participation in the electoral process. To deem expedient the confirmation in the higher party authorities of the secretaries of party organizations and business executives elected by the workforce. To decide personnel questions openly, with regard for the opinion of the party organizations and the workforce based on the free nomination and discussion of the candidates. The primary party organizations will participate in the formation of the higher party authorities and their machinery and submit appropriate recommendations.

6. The types and amounts of financial backing for the elective party authorities and their machinery will be determined per a decision of a conference of the oblast party organization and obkom plenum under the strict supervision of the auditing commissions and notification of the communists.

7. Proceeding from the understanding that the division of functions of party and state is the basis for a strengthening of the CPSU's political authority in society, a task of the party organizations should be implementation of party decisions via the communists working in the soviets of people's deputies. To consider nonobligatory combination of the offices of first secretary of the party committee and chairman of the soviet of people's deputies. This question will be decided by the soviet with regard for the opinion of the pertinent party committee, proceeding from specific conditions.

8. To regard as a priority task of the communists preparations for the upcoming elections to the republic and local soviets of people's deputies. To strive for the nomination to the soviets of communists and nonparty people enjoying the trust of the population and uncompromisingly upholding socialist values.

9. To perform the necessary reorganization of the structure of the elective party authorities and their machinery and delineate the functions of the party and soviet authorities. To exclude parallelism and duplication in the work of the oblast and Leningrad city party committees on the basis of combination of the offices of committee first secretaries, a revision of the structure of the party machinery and the regulation of its functional duties.

10. While advocating the creation of a party organization of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], we reject the idea of the conversion of the CPSU into a confederation of parties of the union republics. The CPSU should remain a single international party with a single program and statutes.

11. For the purpose of an extension of the processes of democratization in intra-party life we consider essential the following changes to the CPSU Statutes:

- at the decision of meetings, conferences and congresses direct elections, on a basis of choice included, of party committee and bureau secretaries may be held. A communist's tenure of one and the same elective office from the raykom through the CPSU Central Committee is limited to two terms in succession. Secretaries of party committees and primary party organization bureaus are elected for no more than three terms. A communist may not simultaneously be a member of more than two elective party bodies;
- obkoms, gorkoms and raykoms and primary party organizations independently determine the structure of their system based on the territorial-production principle, the periodicity of meetings, plenums and conferences, the numbers of full-time party officials and the amounts of their salaries within the limits of the established wage fund and maximum rates;
- party enrollment to be effected with regard for the opinion of the workforce. The decision of the primary party organization on acceptance as a party candidate and the institution of party proceedings against a communist is final. The higher party authorities will examine them in the event of an appeal or on their own initiative. Persons who have committed crimes are expelled from the CPSU after the sentence of the court has assumed the force of law;
- each communist has the right at the time of transfer to work in a higher party body to remain on the register of the primary party organization which promoted him;
- a communist may leave the party on the basis of personal application in accordance with a decision of the primary party organization examined by the gorkom and raykom;
- as petitioned by the primary party organizations, the gorkoms and raykoms will in individual instances (old age, prolonged illness) adopt decisions on the exemption from the payment of membership dues and obligatory attendance at party meetings in respect of certain communists.

12. To address to the CPSU Central Committee the following proposals:

- concerning the suspension of current instructions pertaining to intra-party matters and the elaboration of temporary rules, with regard for the propositions of this platform, in effect until the adoption by the 28th CPSU Congress of new statutes, by which the party organizations will be guided;
- concerning the elaboration of regulations governing the honorary title "Veteran of the CPSU" stipulating the procedure of its attribution to persons who have made a significant contribution to the realization of party policy;
- concerning the establishment of a fixed norm of deductions from the sum total of membership dues for local CPSU organizations for the party budget with the right of use of the remainder for the needs of the party organizations of the region;
- concerning the procedure of the democratic election of delegates to CPSU conferences and congresses.

In the Sphere of Socioeconomic Policy

Responsible for the state of development of the socioeconomic sphere, Leningrad's communists will increase their influence on social processes, on the economy included, by political methods, which means that the party influences not from without but from within the state and business organizations by means of the activity of its members. It formulates economy policy in the interests of the working people and defends its soundness at all levels.

The CPSU reserves the right to hold to account communists responsible for specific areas of economic building. In accordance with the statutes, it selects, trains and promotes cadres, defending their candidacies at all levels. A communist may hold office when he elicits people's trust by his authority and personal position.

1. A rise in Leningraders' living standard is the communists' main political and economic task. Its accomplishment is directly connected with realization of the demands of the masses at large for a strengthening of social justice, discipline and organization and increased responsibility for the results of labor and the enlistment of each Leningrader in the constructive process of perestroyka.

2. To make in 1990 preparations for the transition of Leningrad and Leningrad Oblast to self-management and self-financing. To make the utmost use here of the creative potential of Leningrad science, having provided for the priority solution of social questions, the development of various forms of socialist ownership, an acceleration of S&T [science and technology] progress and the elaboration of the strategy and tactics of the struggle against inflationary processes.

Considering that the state enterprises are the base form of our economy, to consider a priority task of the economic reform the need to strive for realization of their maximum efficiency, creating for this the necessary political and economic and legal prerequisites.

To this end to address to the USSR Supreme Soviet the following demands:

- the immediate elaboration and adoption of a common socialist enterprise act stipulating enterprises' equal rights on the basis of various forms of ownership;
- the immediate elaboration and introduction of measures to cut off the income of enterprises and cooperatives not backed up by the appropriate production of goods and services;
- the pursuit of a balanced policy in respect of the denationalization of state property, bearing in mind

the growing concentration under current conditions of financial resources in the shadow economy;

- acceleration of the formation of a state tax system, meaning the development of state tax inspection authorities, the immediate introduction of a mechanism of the direct taxation of all types of personal income via a system of financial declarations and the abolition of the indirect centralized taxation of workers of state enterprises.

3. For the purpose of an improvement in services to decentralize management of housing and municipal services, trade, public catering, consumer service, health care, education and other spheres of the social infrastructure by way of an extension of the economic and financial independence of the administrative areas and the transfer to them of a number of functions from the Leningrad oblast and city soviet ispolkoms [executive committees].

To elaborate and adopt regulations governing the status of administrative areas of the city and oblast.

To transfer a number of areas of the city and rayon in 1990 by way of experiment to self-management and self-financing.

4. To comprehensively develop a program of the conversion of the region's defense enterprises. Losses of highly skilled workers and specialists, the winding down of science-intensive and high-technology works and a lowering of the overall level of development of the region's industry cannot be permitted here. To organize this very year at enterprises of the defense industry and mechanical engineering complex the additional manufacture of consumer goods and equipment for Leningrad's food, light and medical industry enterprises, agriculture and housing.

5. For fulfillment of the "Housing 2000" program to increase the amount of the production and supplies of construction materials in the next 3 years to a level satisfying the region's requirements, thanks to a temporary reduction in industrial construction included.

To create the necessary privileges for enterprises, organizations and individual citizens in the construction and major renovation of apartment houses with their subsequent settlement of the living space which has been built or renovated. To perfect the structure of construction industry, specifically, a sharp increase in the amount of monolithic house building, the development of MZhK [expansion unknown], the creation of joint ventures and so forth.

To attract the resources of enterprises, individual citizens and foreign firms for the construction, operation and maintenance of housing.

6. To change the current approaches and adopt special measures to solve ecological problems and improve sanitary conditions and amenity provision in the city and oblast. To take public opinion more fully into account here. For enterprises and departments to ensure on the basis of the introduction of waste-free technology, the elimination of ecologically harmful works and the preferential construction of purification installations a sharp reduction in the negative impact on the environment. To prevent the construction of new and the modernization of operating facilities of any department without ecological expert appraisal.

To have completed by 1990 the elaboration of a common scientific ecological concept of the use of nature in the region. To formulate a mechanism of economic, administrative and social pressure on officials and inhabitants violating the requirements of ecological safety, the rules of civic improvement and the standards of sanitary conditions.

To create a single state system of nature conservation and supervisory activity in the region. To consider a most important factor determining the overall level of ecological safety, sanitary conditions and amenity provision in the region an utmost increase in the standards and civic responsibility of both business executives and specialists and also each inhabitant of the city and the revival of Leningraders' commonly acknowledged traditions in this respect. To introduce into the system the publication of information on the ecological situation.

7. To support and develop in every possible way the initiatives of the workforce, public organizations and formations and individual citizens pertaining to the rendering of the needy strata of the population material, financial and other assistance as far as the enshrinement of these initiatives in law.

To support the creation of public assistance funds and aid to veterans and inhabitants of blockaded Leningrad, invalids and needy families. To seek the adoption of decisions by the organs of state power improving housing and social conditions and increasing the social support for blockade veterans, the elderly and single people.

8. To promote the development of a civilized cooperative movement in the region. To regulate the work of the youth's S&T creativity centers and financially autonomous enterprises set up by the Komsomol authorities. In accordance with the USSR Cooperative System Act, for the local organs of soviet power to put a stop to nonstatutory activity leading to the acquisition of unearned income. To make fuller use of the rights of the administrative authorities, people's control and public, state and other control organizations for combating bribe-taking, crime and other violations of economic and financial discipline.

9. For the purpose of an improvement in provision of the population of the Leningrad region with food to effect:

- the harmonious combination of various forms of realization of socialist ownership: sovkhozes [state farms] with leased subdivisions and their associations, leased subdivision cooperatives, tenant and

private subsidiary plots and group horticulture, given economically equal conditions of their management;
- the concentration of the efforts of research institutions of the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences located in the region on the solution of problems of the intensification of the agricultural production of Leningrad Oblast as the base oblast in the RSFSR's Non-Chernozem zone;
- the extensive introduction of ecologically safe intensive techniques of the production of agricultural products and a significant reduction here in the proportion of manual labor thanks to the use of new machinery and equipment developed and manufactured by enterprises of the defense complex in conjunction with Leningrad's research institutions;
- the fundamental modernization and new construction of facilities of processing and food industry and storage depots. To create in each rayon of the oblast a network of repositories for fruit, vegetables and potatoes and shops and facilities for the processing of meat and dairy and fruit and vegetable products and the baking of bread products with their provision with scarce equipment thanks to its manufacture at enterprises of Leningrad's defense complex;
- the priority allocation of financial and material resources and an increase in construction capacity for social and industrial construction in the agro-industrial complex;
- the transition of Leningrad's rayons to self-sufficiency in vegetable produce and potatoes produced on the sovkhozes of Leningrad Oblast thanks to their joint activity pertaining to their production, storage, processing and sale on the basis of a program of sponsored assistance to the countryside for 1990-1995 providing for the cultivation and harvesting of preplanned amounts of agricultural produce;
- the utmost development of the cooperation of the outfits of industrial and agricultural enterprises in an increase in food production. The formation on the basis of administrative areas of Leningrad and the oblast on a mutually profitable basis of "town-country" associations. To use here various forms of the joint labor of agricultural and industrial enterprises, taking as a basis the experience of the Baltic Shipping Line, the "Leninets" Central Science-Production Association and a number of enterprises of Vasileostrovskiy Rayon;
- additional measures to reduce the discrepancy in the provision of the population of the oblast with food and consumer goods compared with Leningrad.

To prepare proposals for the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers on the following questions of assurance of the normal functioning of the Leningrad region's agro-industrial complex:

- the equivalence of prices of industrial-construction and agricultural products;
- the balance of the planned amounts of purchases of agricultural products with material-technical resources;
- elimination of the lag in the development of the social sphere of the countryside.

10. To elaborate with the participation of Leningrad's scientists and specialists proposals concerning a uniform program of health in the Leningrad region and to discuss it with the population; to initiate a struggle for a healthy way of life. To create in the 13th Five-Year Plan in each medical-sanitation zone of Leningrad medical and prophylactic establishments for rendering the population the full range of medical assistance.

To unite the efforts and resources of enterprises and medical establishments of the city and oblast for the purpose of better provision with and fuller use of diagnostic and other medical equipment.

11. For the purpose of a strengthening of the socioeconomic situation of the Leningrad region to submit to the USSR and RSFSR supreme soviets and the USSR Council of Ministers proposals:

- concerning ratification of the concept of the Leningrad region's transition to self-management and self-financing;
- concerning the granting to the Leningrad region in respect of the solution of economic and social problems of the powers of a union republic;
- concerning the revision and cancellation of a number of decrees adopted earlier on the location and construction in Leningrad and the oblast of industrial facilities, except for enterprises manufacturing consumer goods, and to channel the capital investments and construction organization capacity thus released into the solution of most acute problems in the social and cultural sphere;
- concerning the reconstruction of the historic center of Leningrad.

12. To create in Leningrad a uniform system of state and public control based on the people's control authorities.

Workers Support Platform

90UN0434C Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 29 Nov 89 p 3

[LenTASS report: "Active Support"]

[Text] Active support for the decisions of the joint plenum of the Leningrad Obkom and Gorkom [oblast and city party committees] was expressed by the working people of the "Kirovskiy Zavod" Association. The Kirov people made this known at a meeting yesterday with B.V. Gidaspov, first secretary of the obkom and gorkom.

Addressing those assembled, he emphasized that the draft platform of the Leningrad party organization had been discussed in many outfits, and over 20,000 of the most diverse comments and proposals had been collected. This had made it possible to express most fully in the document adopted at the plenum the working people's wishes. It was now a question of putting into practice what had been mapped out.

The main task today is making the party the most democratic part of society. The communists must be in contact with people constantly and know and take account of their opinions. They may vary, it being important only that the goal—the building of a society free of any of man's exploitation of man—be common.

Some ideologists are attempting currently to drive a wedge between the working class and the intelligentsia, communists and nonparty people and the Leningrad party organization and the CPSU Central Committee. This, B.V. Gidaspov declared, is a shameless provocation, and, like any provocation, should be emphatically rebuffed.

The workers, engineers and party officials who spoke at the meeting spoke of the complex economic situation in the city and the country and the need for the increased responsibility of everyone for his assigned work and exactingness toward himself and those around him. It was a question of it being time to adopt effective measures against corruption, abuse in trade and the rise in crime.

In the appeal which was adopted the tractor builders called on the communists and all working people of the city to display an understanding of the situation, responsibility for the fate of the state and proletarian solidarity and organization and to set the country an example of stable and precise work and high consciousness and discipline. The Kirov people appealed for the consolidation of all progressive forces of society around the CPSU in the interests of the renewal of socialism. Expectations were addressed to the obkom and gorkom for more decisive action for the achievement of the goals mapped out by the joint plenum.

Popov Ideas on Economic Reform Criticized

PM1912114589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 16 Dec 89 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Candidate of Juridical Sciences V. Vorobyev, datelined Blagoveshchensk: "Bread Roll for One in Ten?"]

[Text]

The Goal—Total Denationalization

What will our lives be like tomorrow and will it be possible to stop the negative trends in the economy? What path should we take? What is the point of the economic reform? Various answers are given to these questions. People listen not only to each other, but also to our prominent journalists, economists, sociologists, historians, and jurists. Many of them are known as left-wing radicals and revolutionaries and their views are regarded as progressive and constructive. They are advocates of "radical" economic reform. Particular popularity is enjoyed by G. Popov, doctor of economic sciences, chief editor of the USSR Academy of Sciences journal VOPROSY EKONOMIKI, and USSR people's deputy. Certain of his views on questions of economic reform have long been published in our press. But recently, in a long article under the characteristic headline "On the Benefits of Inequality" in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA (No. 40, 1989), he fully revealed his concept of economic reform.

Let us try to analyze it. I will have to quote abundantly from G. Popov to ensure that I am not accused of distorting the facts.

So where is G. Popov summoning us?

The first question: What should we do? The economist writes that the "first remedy against the crisis is **denationalization**" (my emphasis—V.V.). This lies in creating (!) alternatives to the state type of property: Individual (private) property, cooperative property, property of the labor collective divided equally among its members, and property of the labor collective divided unevenly among its members (for instance, via shares).

Some property remains state property, but it, so G. Popov writes, requires fundamental perestroyka—**decentralization,** that is, division into union, republican, and local property (this is of course necessary). However, in all cases the holder of state property will be a leased enterprise.

There is a need here for consistent **demonopolization,** that is, for the division of state associations into autonomous enterprises and of enterprises into autonomous shops, production units, hospitals, cafeterias, sports complexes, and so forth, and also for the formation of new competing enterprises involving imports and foreign firms.

Finally, there is the transfer of land to the peasants as of spring 1990 and the emergence of peasant farms. G. Popov makes no mention of kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes [state farms], as though he does not envision their continued existence.

Overall, G. Popov's concept consists of dividing all the country's common wealth into small parts with their own individual "masters." But what is even more astonishing is his thoughts when he speaks of specific methods of denationalization (decentralization, demonopolization, decollectivization) and their presumed results.

The economist thinks that denationalization should take place as follows: First, you calculate "the average share of the common wealth which each citizen of the country is on average entitled to claim." Second, in the course of denationalization means of production within this quota are transferred without payment, while everything in excess of the quota must be redeemed either immediately or gradually.

It's all quite simple, it transpires! You just take the whole country and divide it up among people's individual pockets. Those who wish to (there will be such people) can also buy up some more—land, a plant, a steamship.... Either individually or collectively. What will we gain as a result? G. Popov writes: "The ultimate aim of the changes is a free market with free competition," "a genuinely free market that will determine both socially necessary expenditure and the real price of goods." The author makes the proviso that this may lead to inflated prices, speculation, and the enrichment of bureaucrats (?), which "hits the main strata of our people."

Which is to be defended: The market, with its speculation, or the "main strata of our people?" G. Popov clearly opts for the market and its components. He writes that it is impossible to use methods of "rigid administrative suppression of speculation, cooperatives, and essentially the market as such." That is an interesting revelation: If we are in favor of a free market, we must also be in favor of speculation. Speculation and the cooperatives are part of the same system.

But what is to become of the working people, or, in the author's terminology, the "main strata of our people?" When it comes to them administrative regulation is possible, albeit administrative regulation that is "strictly metered, not dependent on the identity of leaders, and under the control of democratic institutions." To this end he proposes "administratively guaranteeing a minimum level of consumption," with minimum quantities of basic foodstuffs and everyday consumer items at firm prices, a "minimum level of basic necessities." **"Unpopular though it may sound—the introduction of a ration-card system"** (my emphasis—V.V.). "Ration cards must be the same for the whole country and ration-card stores must be rigidly separated from free trade by direct monitoring by working people. Accordingly, enterprises must be given a state order for this minimum quantity of goods."

Is everything clear? We will give the "main strata" of the people a minimum quantity of basic necessities strictly regulated by the state (bread, sugar, soap, and maybe artificial leather shoes), and everything else will be freely traded at free prices. Cornucopia!

However, there is nothing new in this. G. Popov is reviving the system of trade that existed in our country immediately after the war, until ration cards were abolished in 1947. The economist is proposing to return to this system: The "masses" get things on ration cards, while the select few (with fat purses) get things via free trade. The only difference is that 40 years ago prices in commercial stores were firm, though "steep," and were established by the state, but now they may be not 10 but 100 times higher.

What Lies Behind the Concept-Juggling

G. Popov calls his proposals a "bridge to the future." I quote: "Yes, this scenario is very complex. But it has prospects, it contains the bridge to the future. Whereas the ideas of total control contain nothing except fear of a conservative coup."

In the meantime there is a "bridge to the future" involving controls for the working people and an absence of controls for everyone else. When in time we have crossed this bridge, a "bright future" will begin—we will abolish the ration-card system, and all that will be left will be free trade, at higher prices, of course. Thus will begin a "reign of freedom"—freedom for "fat cats" to live at other people's expense. The kind of freedom whereby not labor but money will dominate in society. You don't believe me? Then let us listen to G. Popov.

Although he says that in the economic system he is proposing income is determined by the results of labor, "these results themselves are evaluated by the market, to which expenditure of time, physical effort, and in general the working person's personal input matter considerably less than they do to the fulfillment of the plan target."

Thus labor itself ("expenditure of labor, physical effort, and the working person's personal input") will be secondary. What then will take first place? "Market income," that is, the kind of income that "is commonly... identified with unearned income" because, "in the eyes of many working people... it may not seem commensurate with expenditure of their labor."

How uneducated many working people are in our country to regard speculation as unearned income! They should just keep on working away. It must be explained to them that market income (speculation) is the yardstick of the new system. So G. Popov makes this more specific. "The most substantial change is the emergence of income for past labor, without any current physical or mental efforts," that is, "money that makes money." "Income stemming from money will become an everyday phenomenon." "Types of activity such as brokerage, buying and selling, investment of money, and organizational activity in general will become highly lucrative." In my view, G. Popov has expressed everything quite clearly. Essentially he is urging that all work (labor) be abandoned and the whole country be turned into a Riga market [haunt of private traders near Riga Station in Moscow]. In case someone doesn't believe me, I will quote once again: "The intention is to replace the working person's interest only in a job and in labor with interest in the real results of labor" and "to change... the very nature of the operation of the law of distribution according to the results of labor." Bluntly put!

There is now a great deal of criticism of the USSR Constitution. The majority abuse it out of ignorance, but some people are pursuing very definite goals—it prevents them from implementing their ideas. Take Article 14 of the constitution: "The source of growth in social wealth and the well-being of the people and of each Soviet person is Soviet people's labor, free from exploitation.... Socially useful labor and its results determine a person's position within society." Article 10 provides that "no one is entitled to utilize socialist property for purposes of personal gain or for other mercenary purposes."

Many journalists are now saying that our constitution contains a lot of "slogans." No, they are not "slogans!"

The essence of any constitution is that it formulates the basic principles of society's life, and constitutional norms are principles, biblical commandments, as it were, for the members of society and also, I would venture to say, tenets of human behavior. We used to sing: "Labor will be master of the world." But now it is clear that Article 14 of the constitution does not suit G. Popov.

Those Foolish "Masses"

In setting out his concept of the reform, G. Popov realizes that, as he himself writes, it cannot be introduced "without relying on the masses, without an exceptionally vigorous struggle by the masses." But G. Popov is totally lacking in confidence that the people will support him, because "the new system promises the masses differentiation of incomes. They will have to struggle so that one section of society can earn ten times as much as the other." Everything is clear: One in ten is going to live at the expense of the other nine, who may not like this. So the author asks: "How are all members of society to be involved in the struggle for the new system without concealing what this system promises for them?" since we all have the wrong outlook, "for the country has not passed through the school of developed capitalism." Not socialism, but capitalism! We are all undeveloped so far as capitalist spirit is concerned, we are still infected with that rotten socialist spirit. We know nothing about capitalism.

So what is to be done? Pensioners are easily dealt with. G. Popov proposes giving compensation "to those strata of the population (pensioners, and so forth) which created the common wealth but for which it is now too late to start to build life on the basis of the new mechanism." Everything is clear: We'll give pensioners an extra R20 on their pension and at the same time will create a market with unrestricted prices. But what about the people as a whole? After all, as the economist realizes, there is a danger that millions of people insufficiently bound by the new property relations or not yet guided at all by the new economic interests may take part in elections and meetings or generally take to the streets, and "...which candidate to support—the citizen does not yet know this." The people ("the masses") do not understand these new property relations. They constitute the "aggressive majority" (in the terminology of the "Interregional Deputies' Group") that has prevented the "left-wing radicals" from implementing their ideas.

Therefore these masses, or, as G. Popov writes, unrestricted democracy whereby the voters have the right to influence everything... is always fraught with the danger that social justice will develop into leveling. [Sentence as published] Indeed, these "voters who influence everything" simply cannot grasp that social justice as propounded by G. Popov is when some (the minority) have everything and receive unearned income as a result of speculation in the "past labor" in which the majority has participated. After all, the main result of perestroyka (according to Popov) is the differentiation of people according to income, a "system of economic inequality." Voters with the right to influence everything may demand (I quote) "the introduction of any property taxes or the 'suppression' of economic inequality by a system of powerful social guarantees for less well-off strata." This prospect worries G. Popov: "Will the masses go for this version of a system of economic inequality compensated for by large-scale democracy and personal freedom...?" And he adds: "The contradiction between the democracy on an unprecedented scale which we need and the growth of economic inequality is the main problem of our perestroyka." It is indeed a problem. Some (the majority) will have democracy and the personal freedom to sell their labor, and the others will have the income, the money.

So what conclusions should be drawn from G. Popov's revelations?

It is a question of nothing other than a revival of capitalist relations in our country. Popov calls for an end to "administrative," "barracks" socialism and the creation of a "new economic system" but nowhere does he call it socialist, just as he nowhere calls socialist the market he is planning or the "new" democracy.

Maybe he is alone in his views? No, such views are extremely widespread among our scientific and official intelligentsia. Moreover, you get the impression that our economists have been able to impose their views on the government and that the government has uncritically accepted them.

Another point. Why have our super-humane economists, after going on at such length about freedom of the individual and human rights, suddenly begun to demand that people be regarded as "manpower—a commodity"? Will the human individual be elevated because the "working person" (as we say nowadays) is transformed into "manpower?" Why does no one say that if people are transformed into "manpower," there will be merchants trading in this commodity?

Quite a paradoxical situation has emerged in the discussion of the draft Law on Ownership. The fate of our social system is being decided. Yet the draft has effectively been discussed secretly, among a narrow circle of committees. True, it has been published for nationwide discussion, but not the government version but that proposed by the committees. What then is there to take issue with? Will they listen to us? Who is going to be able to discuss this draft? After all, freedom of the press in our country has been transformed into freedom for the press of rather narrow elite groups, above all, the "Moscow regional group." You hear their voices on radio, on television, and in the newspapers almost every day. As for the remarks of others (from the "main masses of the people" and among the "manpower"), they will fleetingly appear in certain newspapers (there will be no time for serious discussion in scientific publications), but what can these others decide if the draft is already prepared, if "time is pressing" and we have to have a law by the end of the year. Won't this be a parody of "general discussion?"

We criticize Stalinism for collectivization imposed from above, but is "de-statization" now to be implemented on the basis of a decree hastily adopted on high? Will it have a long existence? Even the Law on the State Enterprise bred so-called group egoism. What is being prepared in our country is a law precisely on group ownership, and therefore group egoism in every possible form!

Does this not run counter to the new concept of democracy—democracy for the people and from the people? Questions such as questions of ownership cannot be resolved without the opinion of the whole people! But the whole people can express such an opinion only in a referendum.

Journals Protest Efforts To Remove Editors

90UN0511A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 50, 16-22 Dec 89 p 3

[Text] Perestroyka has been under way in the country for 5 years now and its main conquest has been glasnost which has strongly boosted the emancipation of the consciousness of our contemporaries, social thought, and culture. A tremendous part in this vitally important process for the country's future is played by the press, including literary journals. It is thanks to a considerable extent to the publications of these journals that the country is acquiring not a mythologized, but its genuine biography—historical, cultural, literary.

The pluralism of public and aesthetic views reflected in full also by the world of journals has become a fact of present-day life. Any disputes, even on the most acute, painful issues, are permissible between journals occupying various ideological positions, and this struggle is perfectly natural in the conditions of a society under renovation. Despite the inevitable costs and lack of culture of the debate at times, the confrontation had up to now not manifestly gone beyond the framework of social and literary polemics. However, we are now observing a fundamental, qualitative change: One side has switched from current affairs arguments to power methods and so-called organizational rulings.

It was for such measures that the participants in the recent plenum of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Writers Union Board called an action conducted in a spirit of the literary pogroms of sad memory. In their speeches, which in tone and level of thought in no way corresponded to the high calling of writer, the speakers roundly came down on the chief editor of the journal OKTYABR and the Leningrad writers organization. "Organizational rulings" were not long in coming: It was proposed that A. Ananyev resign and it was decided to transfer the journal LENINGRAD, newly created by the efforts of the Leningrad writers organization, to the "Sodruzhestvo" Association representing a negligibly small number of Leningrad men of letters. Although an attempt was made to formally substantiate this decision, its underlying motives were obvious, nor did the participants in the plenum make any secret of them.

If we compare this instance with the attempts which have been occurring to replace the editors of certain newspaper publications, a very disturbing conclusion suggests itself: Glasnost once again is experiencing a critical moment, as in the spring of 1988, when a campaign was started up in connection with Nina Andreyevna's article, or in the fall of the same year, when attempts were made to compulsorily limit subscriptions to newspapers and journals.

The haste with which people are endeavoring to replace the leadership of a number of journals and newspapers on the eve of the enactment of the long-awaited press law determining the legal status of the media and defining relations between its promoter and the editorial office seems particularly strange to us. In addition, the replacement of the editor and the publication immediately following a subscription campaign for the following year violates the rights of the subscribers who showed their trust in the editorial board and the editorial team precisely as they are now constituted, and not somehow differently. This is why we consider any actions to replace the editors working currently impermissible and demand a halt to them prior to enactment of the press law.

[Signed] Editorial office of the journal INOSTRANNAYA LITERATURA.
Editorial office of the journal ZNAMYA.
Editorial office of the journal DRUZHBA NARODOV.
Editorial office of the journal YUNOST.

Role of Constitutional Oversight Body Viewed

PM1512093389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Dec 89 Second Edition p 3

[Article by D. Kerimov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and USSR people's deputy: "Buttress of the Rule-of-Law State. Preparing for the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies"; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] The draft USSR Law on Constitutional Oversight in the USSR is being submitted for discussion to the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies on the basis of a USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium resolution of 10 November 1989. The editorial office asked D.A. Kerimov, chairman of the commission responsible for preparing this draft law, to talk about its main provisions.

The formation of a socialist rule-of-law state is inconceivable without establishing strict, constant oversight to ensure that all acts without exception that are adopted by state bodies, social organizations, and officials conform with the USSR Constitution and USSR laws. In addition to the prosecutor's office, which oversees a limited number of acts, this function must become the responsibility of a special state body such as has never existed before in all the years of Soviet power. This is the main explanation for the sad fact that not only has our Basic Law often been circumvented and ignored but has even been violated outright. At times, the USSR Constitution has fulfilled the role of an outwardly democratic facade designed to conceal from prying eyes the lawlessness and tyranny of the personality cult era and the periods of voluntarism and stagnation.

Violation of the Basic Law leads to the destruction of the legal system, considerable weakening of the rule of law and law and order, and an increased lack of control in social development. Hence the important significance of constitutional oversight, which is being introduced in our country on the basis of Article 125 of the USSR Constitution. The draft Law on Constitutional Oversight in the USSR has been drawn up in line with this. Work on this draft has proved far more complicated than we had expected.

Originally, the draft law was prepared in full accordance with the existing Article 125 of the USSR Constitution. However, in the course of our work we found it necessary to propose some changes to this article which do not affect the essence but merely make it clearer and more specific. That is why the draft new wording of Article 125 of the USSR Constitution is also to be submitted to the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies. In particular, it is proposed to supplement the powers of the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee: Not only to decide whether draft laws conform with the USSR Constitution but to decide whether laws already passed and other normative legal acts do so as well. These additional powers certainly do not mean that the committee will take precedence over the country's highest legislative body—the Congress of USSR People's Deputies—because not only will it not abolish or suspend acts of congress, it will leave it to take the final decision on any issue.

In addition to the subjects of the oversight committee indicated in the current Article 125 of the USSR Constitution, it is proposed to include, in particular, international treaty obligations and other obligations of the USSR and the union republics submitted for ratification or confirmation. At the same time, the oversight committee's sphere of influence over republic legal acts will be limited, which has been prompted by present-day demands to improve the Soviet federation and broaden the union republics' sovereign rights, as well as by the need to clearly delimit the powers of union and republic constitutional oversight bodies. The USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee is only concerned with questions of whether union republics' constitutions and laws conform with the USSR Constitution and also with whether these laws conform with USSR laws. Instructions that the committee oversee the issue of whether acts passed by the union republics' councils of ministers conform with the USSR Constitution and all-union laws are to be removed. Oversight of these and all other republic acts is within the competence of the appropriate bodies of the union republics concerned. It should also be particularly emphasized that the adoption of a decision by the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee does not entail either the abolition or the suspension of the constitution of the union republic concerned.

I must point out that this considerable reduction in the powers of the committee in relation to union republics' legal acts appears insufficient to some people's deputies (including two members of our commission). Proceeding from the theoretical precondition that it would be advisable to transfer from a federation to a confederation within the USSR state structure, they reserve their own opinion—namely, that no union republic acts should be liable to oversight by an all-union committee. The commission does not agree with this opinion: Not only because no country in the world with a federal state system has this kind of lack of oversight, but also because it operates on the basis of the fact that a socialist federation does exist in our country.

The present USSR Constitution states that the jurisdiction of the USSR in the shape of its highest bodies of state authority includes the following: Ensuring unified legislative regulation throughout the territory of the USSR; establishing the Fundamentals of Legislation of the USSR and the Union Republics; monitoring compliance with the USSR Constitution; and ensuring that the union republics' constitutions conform with the USSR Constitution. It also states that USSR laws have the same force in the territory of all the union republics and that, if the law of a union republic should diverge from the all-union law, the USSR law takes precedence (Articles 73 and 74 of the USSR Constitution). The provisions of the draft Law on Constitutional Oversight in the USSR are worded in such a way as to fully comply with these constitutional directives.

The range of bodies and persons on whose initiative the committee issues its conclusions is also to be broadened and made more specific. With regard to USSR laws and other acts adopted by the congress, it is no less than one-fifth of all USSR people's deputies, the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and also the highest bodies of state authority in the union republics, which once again underlines their sovereignty within the USSR. As far as the committee's own initiative is concerned, this is confined to verifying the constitutional nature of acts passed by the highest bodies of state authority and administration of the USSR or by other bodies formed or elected by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet. This will make it possible to ensure purposeful organization of the committee's work.

Article 125 of the USSR Constitution is also supplemented by the provision that a decision taken by the committee may only be rejected by a congress decision approved by two-thirds of the votes from the total number of USSR people's deputies. This stems from Article 174 of the country's Basic Law, which stipulates precisely this majority when changing constitutional norms. These and other provisions in the new wording of Article 125 of the USSR Constitution are reflected and developed in the draft Law on Constitutional Oversight in the USSR, which can be divided into two main parts.

The first part is concerned with general questions of constitutional oversight. It primarily makes the point that constitutional oversight in the USSR is being established to ensure that acts passed by state bodies and social organizations conform with the USSR Constitution and the constitutions of the union and autonomous republics and to protect the democratic foundations of Soviet society, the rights of the USSR peoples, and human rights and freedoms. It goes on to define bodies of constitutional oversight. With regard to the USSR, this function is fulfilled by the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee. As far as the designation of equivalent republic bodies is concerned, they are to be determined by the union and autonomous republics themselves.

The second part of the draft law is wholly concerned with the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee. It is to be elected by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies from specialists in politics and law and is to consist of a chairman, a deputy chairman, and 21 committee members, including one for each of the union republics. It should be pointed out that the formation of the Constitutional Oversight Committee by election is the most democratic method.

Here a number of important features should be noted. First, the committee members are not representatives of the union republics but are elected from people living in the republics concerned. This ensures that all the union republics are encompassed and, at the same time, guarantees the committee members' independence of any given region of the country. Second, the committee members' term in office is stipulated as 10 years. However, in order to ensure continuity in the committee's work, it is proposed to establish the principle that half of the committee may be renewed every 5 years. This will be achieved by the fact that the term in office of 11 members of only the first set of committee members—determined by drawing lots—will expire after 5 years. In subsequent elections, every committee member will be elected for a 10-year term. This kind of procedure is extensively used in world practice. Third, the draft law does not stipulate any age qualification for the committee members, although such qualification does exist in a number of foreign countries. In Czechoslovakia, for example, a person who has reached 35 years of age may be elected as a member of the constitutional court, while in the FRG the qualification is 40 years of age, although no maximum term in office is stipulated. Austria does not stipulate the age of persons who may be elected to the constitutional court, but it does stipulate that on reaching the age of 70 judicial service must end. In the FRG, this age limit has been lowered to 68. These age qualifications appear arbitrary, but they do have some specific scientific validation. I personally believe that the best solution is not to set a minimum and maximum age limit for committee members but to establish the age—70, say—after which it is no longer possible to be elected as a member of the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee.

The draft law introduces a new norm: The chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet swears in persons elected to the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee in the presence of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. This ritual will enhance the authority and responsibility of committee members before the highest body of state authority and all the Soviet people.

It also stipulates that the powers of a person elected to the committee may be terminated ahead of time at his own request to resign; for reasons of health preventing him from performing his duties; if he should break his oath; in connection with a court's verdict of guilty passed against him coming into legal force. In any of these cases, another person is elected for the remaining term in office.

When defining the range of legal acts liable to oversight by the committee, the question arose of making the distinction between this and the general oversight functions of the prosecutor's office. I believe that we have succeeded in finding the optimum version, namely: In addition to the acts specifically listed in the draft, normative legal acts passed by other state bodies and social organizations to which prosecutor's office oversight does not or cannot apply are also liable to oversight by the committee. In light of the above, the opinion that the committee should only oversee USSR laws and conflicts between all-union and republic legislation is unacceptable for the simple reason that then the acts of social organizations, for example, the decisions of local soviets of people's deputies, and USSR Council of Ministers resolutions—which, as practice shows, most frequently violate or arbitrarily distort the USSR Constitution and USSR laws—would be exempt from oversight. The draft law also indicates that the committee's oversight functions do not extend to specific decisions by courts and other bodies.

It devotes a special article to the committee's examination of differences between the USSR and the republics, between union republics, and between union republics and national-state, national-territorial formations over constitutional acts adopted by their bodies of state authority and administration. Here it should be pointed out that, when resolving disputes of this nature, the committee may determine only the legal aspect of the question—certainly not the political aspect. Consequently, we believe that, when drafting the new USSR Constitution, it will be necessary to define and carefully and correctly regulate the mechanism for examining the aforementioned differences, without in any way violating the principles of the Soviet federation.

Another democratic principle is a characteristic feature of the draft law. Unlike similar bodies in capitalist countries, whose decisions usually rescind unconstitutional acts, a decision by the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee, as already noted, not only does not have the power to rescind—it does not even suspend the the union republic constitutions, USSR laws, and other acts passed by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies which do not conform with the USSR Constitution. But the force of all other acts liable to oversight by the committee will be suspended in the event of their failing to conform with the USSR Constitution and USSR laws, until the point of nonconformity indicated in the decision is eliminated. The body which issued the act is obliged to eliminate the point or points of the act which do not conform with the USSR Constitution or a USSR law within 3 months. On the expiry of this deadline, if the point of nonconformity has not been removed, the committee will make representations to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet, or the USSR Council of Ministers accordingly with regard to rescinding the act or individual provisions of the act passed by the body or official within their jurisdiction that fails or fail to conform with the USSR Constitution or a USSR law. In the event of the USSR Supreme Soviet rejecting the committee's decision, the question will be examined by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, whose decision is final.

The adoption of the USSR Law on Constitutional Oversight in the USSR by the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies will undoubtedly play an enormous role in forming a socialist rule-of-law state, improving Soviet legislation, and strengthening legality and law and order in the country. This will create favorable conditions for speeding up the process of restructuring and renewing our society on a genuinely socialist basis.

Sociological Center Head on CPSU Role

90UN0479A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 13 Dec 89 p 10

[Report on interview with Director of the Center for Sociological Studies of the Academy of Social Sciences of the CPSU Central Committee, Vice President of the Soviet Sociological Association, Doctor of Philosophy Professor Zhan Terentyevich Toshchenko by Deputy Editor in Chief of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA Yuriy Poroykov: "What the Party Can and Should Know About Itself"; date and place not given]

[Text] A broad discussion on the party, its role and place in the political system of society, its forms and methods of work in the environment of perestroyka, and ways to renew party activities has developed in the party organizations of the country and in the press.

Deputy Editor in Chief of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA Yuriy Poroykov interviewed Director of the recently created Center for Sociological Studies of the Academy of Social Sciences of the CPSU Central Committee, Vice President of the Soviet Sociological Association, Doctor of Philosophy Professor Zhan Terentyevich Toshchenko.

[Poroykov] So, what can and should the party know about itself?

[Toshchenko] Everything!

[Poroykov] Just like that?

[Toshchenko] Provided, of course, that two conditions obtain: that there is the desire to know and to proceed on the basis of this knowledge in all spheres of one's activities.

[Poroykov] Is what you have said to mean that both of these conditions did not obtain?

[Toshchenko] Both yes and no. Yes, because much of what is happening today has sort of caught the party unprepared. No, because the party itself was the originator of these events.

[Poroykov] And the party also called in the fire on itself?

[Toshchenko] Indeed, it called in the fire on itself. The demands placed on the party are increasing. Tension in both our society and inside the organization is growing correspondingly. The unexpected discussion of Article 6 of the Constitution at the session of the Supreme Soviet—this is a fundamental issue indeed—is the best proof of this, incidentally, as well as the results of the roll call vote: The votes split almost equally. For me as a sociologist it is important to keep in mind in all of that that 85% of the members of the Supreme Soviet are communists.

[Poroykov] Did you say "the unexpected discussion?"

[Toshchenko] Yes, to some degree. It was spontaneous rather than organic for this period. I believe that it was even provoked by the situation emerging in the country, including dissatisfaction with the procrastination in restructuring the party. Incidentally, almost one-third of those polled by us recently stated that they have lost their hope that the party is capable of renewal and gaining a vanguard position. Therefore, as you can see, the "surprise" was undoubtedly coming, and had to be manifested sooner or later. It has turned out that the time is now.

Here are the latest data—over one-third of the communists have come out in favor of revising the article of the Constitution on the leading role of the party.

[Poroykov] In this case, can we refer to a crisis in the party?

[Toshchenko] I would not refer to a crisis. For now I would not. The manifestation of contradictions does not amount to a crisis. The latter occurs when these contradictions or, more precisely, their resolution run into a dead end... The search is on for ways to renew the party, to democratize it, to define a more precise place for it the political structure of society. Is this a crisis? It would be another matter if the party ignored the increasing dissatisfaction with it, as has already happened many times in the course of history, and embarked on applying pressure...

[Poroykov] However, there are cases of this nature.

[Toshchenko] Indeed, there are such facts. However, a fact does not yet amount to an argument, or even several facts. Or, as the French say, even 100 rabbits together do not make up a horse. Isolated regional flare-ups, and the slogan-like imperatives of extremists cannot subvert the course of the party toward renewal and inner perestroyka. Certainly, there is an issue here, and it is about the pace. At present, this is also the focus of a tremendous number of political, ideological, socioeconomic, and moral problems... This is to say nothing about the psychological problems which we still underestimate... Well, concerning your question about the crisis... The theory of management states that given 30% of those dissatisfied or critically-minded individuals the disorganization of a system begins, and at 50% a crisis and disintegration begin. In our case, as if we have already noted, it is 35%. Can these rules be automatically applied to a political organization? I believe they cannot. Despite all the similarity of certain external parameters, a political system, unlike an organizational and technical system, apparently is also subject to its own laws, and is guided by a more complex sociopolitical mechanism. We do not know it well, putting it mildly. Let us recall the crushing defeat of Churchill and his party in the victorious year 1945, as they were riding the crest of success. Who could have expected this? Or the tremendous popularity of Yu.V. Andropov in our country in the negligibly short period of time when actually nothing essential occurred in either the country or the party. Only intentions were set forth, and even those aimed at reinforcing discipline and responsibility rather than renewing life and democratizing social institutions... More examples of this kind which are even more recent may be quoted; however, this is not the point here. We do not know these trends and, therefore, we cannot make any forecasts. We pay heavily here for not appreciating science in general enough in the past and specifically for regarding it as a servant of politics rather as the most important instrument of working out and adopting a political resolution.

[Poroykov] Let us go back to the situation in our country which, naturally, is a serious influence on the opinion the people have of the party. At present, many of the most fearful suppositions and predictions are in circulation from a complete disintegration of the economy to (knock on wood) a civil war... Does this not indicate that public consciousness is in a state of, shall we put mildly, extreme alarm?

[Toshchenko] The people are, undoubtedly, concerned, and there are grounds for this. As far as public consciousness is concerned... We cannot evaluate it unambiguously, all the more so because public consciousness is not just a simple total of the consciousness of individuals. This is why I will put it like this: Many responses by people to particular social processes reflect their psychological condition to a great degree. This condition can be measured. Therefore, at present it is perhaps more precise to refer to the mood of the people. It is indeed irritated and it fluctuates within a quite considerable range. This is not as innocuous as it might seem at first sight: In theory, the mood is the first step in inducements and behavioral motives...

Let us recall Chekhov on this occasion. I would not vouch for this being a faithful quotation, but I believe that I am not going to distort the sense of his saying. If we were to receive now the freedom which we talk about so much when we tear into each other, he wrote, at first we would not know what to do with it. All we would do is waste it in order to convict each other in the newspapers for spying and money-grabbing...and scare society by the assurances that we do not have people, do not have science, do not have literature—we have nothing...

Chekhov was neither a psychologist nor a sociologist but, as I see it, he has picked up on the membrane of his soul of a genius the dramatic nature of a transition by man from one condition of life to another, in particular, from the lack of freedom to freedom. As we have already seen, this path is not lined with roses only. For example, there were the strikes of miners. They provide a good deal of food for thought!

Politics is a complex and responsible endeavor; the trends in this matter are most contradictory, and a majority of them develop in hiding "spewing" the sludge of emerging emotions which are extinguished equally fast. No matter how hot the emotions are we need a cool, sober mind in order not to jump to hasty, incorrect conclusions, especially in the course of making significant decisions the consequences of which can be altogether catastrophic in extreme situations. Plug in any of the cases which have recently aroused and continue to arouse us instead of this one, and you will agree that, despite common sense being an important tool in decision-making, we should still be guided by the precise knowledge of the problem, balanced as much as possible, with all possible variants of its further development predicted. In this matter, you cannot do without science. However, anticipating your question, I will say that we need to create a mechanism which will make it possible to use science to this end.

[Poroykov] Certainly, you mean sociology?

[Toshchenko] Not only, but primarily sociology... However, I would like to wrap up the topic of the situation in the country which we have started. This may come as a surprise to you, but I believe that centrist tendencies are beginning to prevail in public consciousness despite all contradictory excesses and their varying assessments, that is, the understanding of the need for a balanced policy, safeguards against adventurism and the threat from both the right and the left is taking hold increasingly. People are tired of mutual wrongs, insults, and suspicions—this is obvious. It is equally obvious that there is the striving for stability and certainty. Some interpret this as a manifestation of conservative tendencies and even a turn to the right. I have a different point of view. For the ease of explanation, I will allow myself to compare the mood which develops in the course of "adjusting" the hand with the feeling of a man to whom his soup appears unsalted after he has eaten a slice of herring... Seriously, the growing support for reasonable actions undertaken by the government speaks in favor of this conclusion. An all-union survey in October showed that 53% of toilers give high grades to the proceedings of the Supreme Soviet and have faith in its power and potential... The support for our political leaders, Gorbachev and Ryzhkov, also looks quite convincing; their performance is approved by between two-thirds and three-quarters of the respondents. In turn, criticism of their actions does not at all amount to disappointment with them and with perestroyka. The following is particularly important in this instance: This is the view of virtually all categories, from miners to foresters, from kolkhoz [collective farm] members to students. Of course, surveys of this nature should be taken regularly; otherwise, they will not make sense. Trends are important. This way we can understand what of it is due to the mood and what has already crystallized as convictions and certainty.

Here is a paradox for you as a small example. A survey of the managers of a new generation at a number of enterprises showed that they give a considerably better evaluation to the results of perestroyka than the general mass of employees. Why? Because they made an effort, they held meetings, they convinced some people, they pushed certain things through. However, in the course of a more profound analysis we found out that actually everything looks considerably more modest.

[Poroykov] Apparently, they wanted to see the results of their activities very much?

[Toshchenko] Of course, this is also a factor; however, the main point still is that the superficial strata of consciousness most frequently reflect the very mood which, as we have already mentioned, is very changeable. This is why the enthusiasm of a mass of people at a meeting is dangerously misleading. Over there, a special psychological mechanism is at work which evokes any emotion very quickly and easily and which can be manipulated splendidly by skillful people. No science will help then. A mob is a mob. One more thing about so-called mass consciousness. I have worked a lot on this issue. Theoretically, we have more or less come close to understanding what mass consciousness is. From a practical point of view, we most often view it as the opinion of a majority. Or—"many people think and believe so." Previously, such accounting satisfied us, but it no longer does. We are obligated to know what and how the other segment of the populace thinks because new ideas are never accepted by all people all at once...

[Poroykov] You mean that initially they appear heretical and later banal?

[Toshchenko] Exactly! As they say, this was said long before our time. I am not going to dwell on this idea in its theoretical aspect. In our practice, we have already encountered a problem—the Laws on Land and on Property. Do you remember how dramatic the discussion at the session was? What will the public discussion indicate?

[Poroykov] I am afraid that those who are interested in land first of all will be in a minority...

[Toshchenko] As well as those who proposed to look at this problem in a new light by, so to say, removing the customary blinders from our eyes... This is where the stereotypes of consciousness will show their full power! In general, this was not hard to predict. If we were to refer to the Law on Land, those who desire to genuinely own it account, according to our data, for 4 to 6% of the peasants.

[Poroykov] That is, we condemn unconventional arrangements to failure ahead of time?

[Toshchenko] As a man who looks to the future with optimism, I am hopeful; as a scientist, I will reserve judgment for now. Do you know why? Because the country is on the move, and a resolute and rapid transformation of the consciousness of millions is under way, primarily that of the stereotypes already mentioned. Life itself compels people to take a new look, evaluate and judge in a new way. The orientation is changing radically even now. For example, the one which has been, perhaps, the most stable over many decades: "Let us have a little patience, tighten our belts today, but tomorrow it is going to get better." Or "If we will not get it our children will." In general, orientation toward a bright future... The pragmatic bearings of consciousness are clearly expressed at present: here and now! Certainly, this complicates the situation greatly, but, as they say, what is done is done. We are looking at a different people, different in a great many aspects. It is important to understand this. We cannot count anymore on the people coming back to the old orientation which was so convenient for manipulation by the top.

I believe that this is one of the reasons for the current quite critical attitude toward the party. To my mind, this is a natural process, and even legitimate to a great degree. One more stereotype of thinking has been at work: The party is responsible for everything. Indeed, it is responsible—for allowing this situation in the country to occur, and for announcing perestroyka as the only way out of it but lingering on at the starting point... How and why this happened is a topic for a separate conversation. Personally, I think that one of the reasons for this is apparently found in the fact that a political organization intertwined with an administrative-command system cannot be extricated from it easily. It is no accident that the number of communists voicing dissatisfaction with the state of affairs in the party is growing; 39% of employees take a negative view of the activities of their party organizations; 33% make negative statements about the prestige of communists. These are alarming signals.

[Poroykov] We began our conversation on a more optimistic note. Or did it just seem so to me?

[Toshchenko] Probably.

[Poroykov] Do you mean to say that you have something for us to rejoice over?

[Toshchenko] I am only suggesting that we approach the problem objectively and in an unbiased manner. Let us begin by stating that they criticize the party apparatus rather than the party. It is exactly the apparatus that is associated in the consciousness of millions of people with the party. Compare this: 56% associate their hopes for improving their life with perestroyka in the party (69% among CPSU members). At the same time, 54% criticize sharply the work of the party apparatus. Communists ask still more of the party: 73% (!) believe that functionaries with mediocre or poor abilities and traits, lacking a bright individuality, analytical thinking, and the skill of convincing and rallying the people dominate in the apparatus of party organs.

[Poroykov] This does sound like a condemnation.

[Toshchenko] I will not argue, but it is rather a knot which needs to be cut rather than untied. Our colleagues from the Sverdlovsk Institute of Philosophy and Law and the Higher Party School established that the perception of a party functionary as an "official," a "flunky" prevails in mass consciousness, and the opinions of communist, Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] members, and non-party members in this matter coincide... This is what we should give a lot of thought to! Whichever way you look at it, we have managed to breed an entire generation of such quite unattractive party office holders... In this case, no usual cadre replacement would do which, incidentally, is what our critically-minded respondents say plainly. This makes a lot of sense: The apparatus which has more than one-half of new functionaries continues to assiduously reproduce the one and the same type of functionary, the old forms and methods of work.

[Poroykov] Once the functions of the party change the type of the party functionary will change too. Or is it that this law does not apply in this instance?

[Toshchenko] I understand your sarcasm....

[Poroykov] I have prepared for you a review of the letters from our readers on the topic of our discussion. There are quite a few of these, and all of them are about the same thing—that arbitrariness, mutual guarantees, complacency, and impunity are still present in the party; many leaders view even minute remarks addressed to them as an attack against their prestige and undermining the leading role of the party, and this is why they defend themselves in every possible way. As before, they do not resign but retire on personal-merits retirement benefits having failed in their work. And so on, and so forth... The dissatisfaction is varied; it extends to virtually all aspects of party activities. However, what is the extent of this dissatisfaction and its parameters with regard to various social groups? Do you have such observations?

[Toshchenko] The intelligentsia is the most critically disposed, and next to it workers in the active age bracket, 30 to 50 years. The level of dissatisfaction is the highest among the members of informal movements. It is important to remember in this instance that the polarization of opinions (the numbers of people holding opposing views are approximately equal) creates conditions for the emergence and activities of pressure groups.

Here is one more paradox: 81% of party functionaries believe their committees to be authoritative and at the same time 78% of them state that the success of their actions is not assured, that they are lost in unconventional situations—at the meetings, during strikes, and so on.

[Poroykov] There is no paradox here! This is a direct consequence of the comfortable existence whereby the authority was guaranteed by the position itself and an enterprise manager or a kolkhoz chairman were responsible for the results of operations... What is the way out of the situation which we have sketched together more or less colorfully?

[Toshchenko] I am not going to talk about a universal strategy. I would like to note what to my mind is the most significant aspect: No matter how complicated a situation develops we should counteract in every way possible political illusions, hare-brained plans, pressure by the so-called pressure groups, and attempts to falsify information on the actual political processes. Of course, we should remember that, as our research indicates, the greatest tension is caused by the slow pace of transformations in the party which promotes the opinion that the party functionaries are reluctant to engage in perestroyka. The dynamism of party life is the most significant factor of political stabilization in our society at present. If we look at it from the standpoint of opinions voiced by the communists themselves, the path in this matter is as follows: 86% of those polled believe that a "merciless" (!) cleansing of the party and a renewal of its ranks are necessary. This is the most serious leap in the course of the last half-year: In June, it was 10%. Ninety-two percent demand that the old apparatus be changed, and 42% of them refer to radical measures. This is yet another confirmation of the fact that the reason for the decline in party authority is found primarily in the structures of the apparatus. I personally view as positive the fact that the communists themselves are more critical in their assessment of the current political situations than others, especially in instances when their own role or the influence of the party on economic and social problems are concerned.

If it were the other way around it would be a much greater sorrow. This would indicate unambiguously that the party has become ossified in its complacency and has altogether stopped picking up any signals from the outside. This would mean its moral and physical death.

[Poroykov] My final question is about the science which you represent. Are you sure that your recommendations will be put to use or that there are guarantees that sociology will not once again turn into a servant of politics thus being deprived of any sense?

[Toshchenko] Of course, there is no complete certainty. A lot depends on the quality of our information. We yet have to prove that sociology—not just sociology but political sociology which I would especially like to stress—is capable not only of ensuring the precise knowledge of all processes, general and partial, which occur in the system of relations of power but also of answering the questions brought up by life and coming up with a no less precise, scientifically verified recommendation and a prediction of the future.

Only then can we count on our information being not only taken into account but also incorporated in the very process of making political decisions. This is the ideal situation. Unfortunately, as of now we can talk about merely beginning such work. You must have noticed the only resolution on social sciences which has been adopted after 1985. This was a resolution on sociology. We may say that this was an historic event for us because for the first time, after long and tiresome arguments, sociology was finally recognized to be a separate scientific field rather than an applied one which it was considered to be until then. Our center was set up pursuant to this resolution. Therefore, if we are to talk about guarantees, they are in this resolution, and also in the fact that the party should indeed know as much as possible about itself.

It would be even more reliable to know everything. Only in this case will the party be able to play the role of a political vanguard in a renewing socialist society developing along quite civilized lines. As the say, there is no other way.

RSFSR Writers View Anti-Russian Sentiment

90UN0399A Moscow NEDELYA in Russian No 47 20-26 Nov 89 pp 16-17

["Selected Excerpts from the Speeches of Writers at the Plenum of the Board of the Writers Union of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic" held on 13-14 November]

[Text] **"For 2 days, the issue 'The Present and Future of Book Publishing in Russia and the Status of Literary and Artistic Journals of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Writers Union' was discussed at a plenum of the board of the Union of Writers of Russia.**

"...The writers spoke weightily about many things in their forum, asking a lot of themselves...

"...This very problem—a spiritually and morally unified multinational Russia and the ways to achieve this—was the main issue on the agenda of the plenum."

(SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 15 November 1989)

A NEDELYA correspondent was present at the plenum of the board of the RSFSR Writers Union. We decided to familiarize our readers with some of the speeches. The excerpts below are largely in keeping with the spirit which prevailed at the plenum of Russian writers and reflect faithfully the tone and nature of the speeches excerpted. Certainly, not all of those present applauded them, and not all of the speakers talked in this manner. We do not believe that this article calls for any comment.

Anatoliy Znamenskiy:

Indeed, who could have thought as little as 2 to 3 years ago that events of a certain nature would assume this devilish character, that decay would come to the fore as powerful and unsightly as can be, and that a magazine with the utterly ideological name OKTYABR (indeed, it is not "10 Thermidore"!) would begin to defame the sacred symbols of the people and carry novels, novellas, and essays of the kind of "Walks With Pushkin" or the rough sketch with the indefinite title "Everything Flows...".

It was the editor (of OKTYABR—editor's note) who on the pages of his magazine blessed the repeated and malicious defamation of the Russian people and their sacred symbols, and in the latest novel "Everything Flows..." allowed himself to openly spit in the face of all Russians, those who were, who are, and, perhaps, those who will be. This people has, supposedly, been slaves for centuries, it has the soul of a slave and accordingly slavish mentality, so why be overly nice to it anyway?

The Russophobic worm hole which was merely becoming a chrysalis on the sly in the novel "Life and Destiny" suddenly spread its wings and flapped, as they say, as a raving lunatic in the wilted and poorly written novel "Everything Flows..."

Incidentally, at the very outset of "the era of building a brilliant future," when the bloom of the revolution was at its peak and the coming "fruit" of modern knowledge was almost unknown, the well-known gang of "pioneers" ["zastrelshchiki"] (derived, perhaps, from the word "to shoot" ["zastrelit"]) did not renounce even the notorious Levinson who managed to lead the guerrilla movement in some corner of Siberia into an impassable area in such a manner that as many as 19 people survived out of a big detachment which was driven into the swamps. Meanwhile, under the barrel of a Mauser gun, the word "rout" was venerated as the word "success" or even "triumph!"

Indeed, can we figure out the reasons for the "rout" if we do not ask the mass, the 19 who survived, but consult exclusively the "strategist" Levinson?

Oh, he will tell you things! You may even spare yourself reading OGONEK or MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI! Everything Russian has been banned and has been severely punished during these 70 years by the people from the supreme clan who have changed uniforms, chevrons, and names: the VChK [All-Russian Extraordinary Commission], the OGPU [United State Political Administration], the RAPP [Russian Association of Proletarian Writers], the LITO [Literature and Publishing Department], the GULAG [Main Administration of Prison Camps], ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, and so on, and so forth...

Vladimir Karpets:

Our distancing is spiritual, the kind about which they said that the time will come when some will go to the right-hand side—that is, right—and others will go to the left-hand side—that is, left. Everything has been said already.

Indeed, in 1985 we started hoping that the troubled time which began in 1917 would come to an end. We had this hope, we believed in it. However, they rebuffed us. They snubbed us in the highest forum and warned us sternly that we were born in October...

I will quote just two excerpts from the "idols" we have worshipped for 72 years. "Not one revolution in Europe and in the entire world will succeed for as long as the Russian state exists in its current form" (Friedrich Engels). Furthermore, "a war between Austria and Russia would be a very useful thing for revolution all over Eastern Europe. However, it is not likely that Franz Joseph and our dear Nicholas would grant us this pleasure." (Lenin).

I must say openly that for as long as Marxism-Leninism continues to be the official ideology of our state, "Walks with Pushkin" and "The April Theses" (Footnote: Meaning the resolution of the Writers Committee "April"—"The Writers of Moscow in Support of Perestroyka"—read at the plenum) are going to continue.

Perhaps it is no accident that we are constantly reminded that what is happening is a revolution, a continuation of the revolution, and that the next party congress will be the one to restore the Leninist norms of life. God forbid!..

...So, what are we to do in the final count? They are forcing the year 1917 on us; let us set the year 1612 against it. We need the Russian statehood, the statehood of Russia, to be restored fully and completely. **(Applause).**

If we grasp it we will have our own Minins, Pozharskis, and Germogens.

What should we rally around to begin with? Around restoring the sacred symbols. This has already begun, this is already happening, and this will happen. This is unstoppable although unfortunately it is coming very slowly. However, I must say that we should begin primarily by restoring the universal glorification of all recent martyrs and confessors of Russia, beginning with the royal family. **(Applause).**

...Let us be faithful to our motherland and to our murdered Sovereign.

I will ask all of you (I know that there are both believers and nonbelievers here; this is why I am not asking to have "Eternal Memory" sung), but I do ask you to rise out of respect for the memory of all the Russian people murdered beginning with the royal family. **(Most of the audience rises to honor their memory).**

Thank you for your attention.

Vladimir Krupin:

...Let us compare how many organs Gorbachev has and how many we have. He can afford to sacrifice PRAVDA, he will get to keep PIONERSKAYA PRAVDA that way, but what are we to do? **(Applause).** If we keep surrendering one organ after the other where are we going to discuss our misfortunes, sorrows, and sacred national symbols, which are the backbone of any people, and all the more so of Russia?

...When our sacred national symbols are at issue we have no right to be silent and surrender a press organ which wants to be independent—this is very strange even from the legal point of view, all the more so since they are advertising the law-governed state all the time.

...If they are publishing things which besmirch our national treasure, our poet, our Russia, why don't we part ways with these people?

Anatoliy Buylov:

...Let us talk about the Jews. Jews are, perhaps, the only ethnic group which is interested in our experiencing discord. Isn't it so? **(A voice from the floor: "What nonsense! It is a shame to listen to you!")** Fine, go on listening. So, the Pamyat Society has come to be; I am not a member of this society, but I like many things about them...

...So, they got rid of the PRAVDA editor. I do not know why they got rid of him. Maybe, because he published this note, a smallish note, to the effect that there is Zionism in our country after all. Do you understand?

I did not know this Jewish theme before. However, how is it they are everywhere in profitable positions? **(Laughter on the floor).** I am told that the Jews are clever. Fine, I agree, they are clever. However, why have they led us into a dead end? **(Laughter, applause)** ...However, let us add to this three times as many who have a different name and wear the guise of a different nationality...

Tatyana Glushkova:

Look at what is happening to Russia which has even had its name taken away and called by the negative word "Non-Chernozem Zone." Look and think about what is going to happen to you, relatively small peoples, if this has been done to a great people, a people with a universal historical role, a people which was quite recently, 70 years ago, as mighty as a warrior!

...The debate which is underway in Moscow, incidentally, as well as in Leningrad, is not at all a group debate. Somebody called it in a semi-ironic manner a debate between the Russians and the Jews. It is far from precise. This is an ethnic-ideological debate. I would not separate these definitions. This is a debate between Zionism, the worst form of universal Fascism, and humanity. This is not a debate but a heroic, mortally dangerous confrontation. Its significance is transnational. What kind of debate is it when the newspaper PRAVDA reports on legalized groups of Zionist commandos, when a Zionist union is set up in Moscow...

There is no concealing that everyone who presently speaks as I do puts himself in mortal danger. He runs a risk as does a Palestinian at present, as someone does who protests the "Pretoria regime" in the Republic of South Africa.

For how much longer will the Russian writers, the legitimate sons of the land of Russia, as Yesenin put it, native Russians moan under the heel of oppressors and usurpers? Look at it: Both Voronin and Vykhodtsev are already turning grey... Meanwhile, they plead and suffer, essentially, as the children of Palestine! **(Applause)** We must help our blood brethren because they are in trouble. Whatever S.V. Mikhalkov might say, Russian blood is thicker than WATER!

They are talking about a split. They drearily pronounce the word "consolidation." All of us remember the years of consolidation when this was believed. All of us know who ensured this consolidation and who made endless concessions, surrendered his pride, his editorial rights, his opportunity to actually live and work. Who made the concessions? Which of the two sides together appeared to be consolidated?

I believe that accusations of a split cannot be leveled at the Board of the RSFSR Writers Union because the fact of setting up the "April" Committee was nothing but a split, a challenge, and a demonstration. The document which they read yesterday (Footnote) (The resolution of "April"—editorial note)—I am even glad that they read it because I felt that some of our leaders have somehow heard for the first time what the "Aprilists" think, do, and state. The insults hurled yesterday at the secretariat of the Board of the RSFSR Writers Union are insults hurled at Russia **(Stormy applause)** because very dirty words were contained therein, profoundly slanderous words.

Why do I believe so? Given the conditions of legal, judicial, and political discrimination which the Russian Federation is facing, such slander and insults hurled at one of our most important sociopolitical structures such as the RSFSR Writers Union are actually and definitely direct insults to Russia and its rights. **(Stormy applause).**

Here is another thing I must tell you. On two occasions, I was present at the meetings of the "April" Committee. We might say that what they write pales in comparison with what they say and how they say it... It is terrifying to sit in that auditorium. These are raving people, literally beside themselves, who speak monstrous words about Russia and the Russians, foaming at their mouths.

I did not get to hear the speech by Anatoliy Buylov yesterday. Later I asked the people: Could it be that he spoke badly? They said: See, he used the word "Jews" just like that! I asked: So what, did he call the Jews the children of Sharikov or, maybe, he called them the children of Doctor Bormental from, say, "The Dog's Heart" at the very least, or maybe he used some insulting negative word, a slur? No, nobody confirmed that such a direct ethnic insult was inflicted. Nonetheless, many venerable writers came forward and attempted to apologize to someone for him, even called him stupid, and said many strange things.

I want to support him not only because he is a writer, but primarily because he is Russian, and at present the Russians need support a million times more than the Jews. When the Jews are going to be in this kind of trouble then I will, perhaps, support them... **(Applause)**

I want to address this not only to Ananyev, without any ethnic attribution at all. I want to address this to Shugayev, and to the Leningrader Arro—I don't know what his ethnic background is. **(Laughter on the floor).** I want to utter the words which are very old: "All of your black blood will not wash off the righteous blood of the poet!" **(Stormy applause)**

I would like to make a proposal. I believe that many people indeed are to blame for what has been happening. The Institute of World Literature is to blame and, in particular, Feliks Feodosyevich Kuznetsov who has been given the floor twice but has not said once that he and the organization he heads feel that they are at fault. When this monstrous lampoon by Abram Terts appeared there was no response of any kind from them. Meanwhile, they had enough spare time to discuss for days on end the shades of greatness of Mandelshtam and Pasternak listening on that occasions to the representatives of Israeli science, and so on.

I would like to see Abram Terts write *"Walks with Sholom-Aleykhem"*.... **(Laughter, applause)**

Sergey Voronin:

...I mean the current extremely complicated situation in our Leningrad organization of writers. The fact that we, Russian writers, account for only 20% in Leningrad, not more than 80 people out of 430—and these are mainly old and sick people—may only be explained by at least the lack of elementary respect for us, the Russian writers, on the part of the Russian-language group of writers in which an overwhelming majority of writers are of the Jewish ethnic background.

How could this happen? There are reasons for this. One of the reasons is the deliberate struggle of group schemers in our organization for seizing all key positions throughout the postwar decades to which the leadership of both the major and minor Writers Union was pandering.

As a result, we can state that the group clan has attained its cherished goal: The Leningrad magazines ZVEZDA, NEVA, AVRORA, ISKUSSTVO LENINGRADA, KOSTER, and ISKORKA have been seized by group schemers; they also control publishing houses whose editorial councils have been created on their instructions... It is a terrible thing to say, but there is not a single playwright in Leningrad who would build on the traditions of the Russian theater.

Valentin Rasputin:

...After all, we cannot make a sacrificial offering of the national minority which "Commonwealth" is turning out to be in Leningrad. **(Applause)** It is time for us to stop retreating, high time... This first step which we will take (Footnote) (Meaning the decision of the plenum to set up a second organization of writers in Leningrad based on the "Commonwealth" Association—editor's note) is the beginning of a split. "Commonwealth" will secede, and it is absolutely clear that other organizations of writers will secede.

I cannot imagine how the Moscow organization of writers can coexist with "April." How is it possible? We should prepare for a split no matter when it happens, whether it begins at this plenum or at the next one. This is unavoidable by now. We have nowhere to retreat anymore in the name of coming to an agreement on points on which we cannot agree because at issue are different attitudes toward the people, culture, and morality. **(Applause)**

Vladimir Shirikov:

...I will recall the frequently brought up resolution of the Council of People's Commissars dated 25 July 1918 "On Combating Anti-Semitism and Pogroms..." I believe the time has come for researchers to study in depth the very reasons for the appearance of this resolution pursuant to which virtually any citizen of Russia could find himself on the wrong side of the law for a single carelessly uttered word. There were such cases. After all, it was said in the upper echelon that there is a pogrom hood and an anti-Semite in every Russian... After all, the label "anti-Semite" was pinned in its time on such personalities of world culture as Cicero, Seneca, Tatius, John Chrysostom, Shakespeare, Dickens, Fichte, Hegel, Kant, Gogol, Dostoyevskiy. In essence, almost the entire culture of the world could be so branded.

Dmitriy Zhukov:

...In 1904, the great Russian scientist Mendeleyev wrote the book "The Cognition of Russia." In this book...he wanted to determine the size of the population of Russia in 1950, the number of Russians. He said the number was 350 million. Meanwhile, we know that in 1950 there were barely 100 million Russians. Where have these people gone? At present, we may refer absolutely definitively to the genocide of the Russian people **(applause)**, to the Russians and the people who considered themselves Russian...being the very ones to be mercilessly exterminated. By 1927 more than 20 million people had already died while Stalin was implementing a program compiled before him. He was "one of..."

However, what do we Russians stand for if we have allowed this to be done to us? Let us think about our national character. Indeed, we Russians love things Russian, we are patriots, we love our ethnic group. However, we do not like each other, and this is our misfortune. If we were to talk about those who strive for world domination we may say that they are diligent and disciplined, that each one of them is a soldier, and that they love each person specifically because they say: "He is one of ours."

...There is no point in engaging in anti-Semitism—I cannot pronounce this word, "Yid-bashing"—and talk about what they are. It is not in them that we have to look for the cause of the tragedy, but in us. We are guilty of not being able to rebuff them.

Yuriy Bondarev:

Our plenum did not just go well, but very well... Where is the proof of that anti-Semitism?... I sat here at the plenum and was happy for my brethren who spoke so beautifully, happy with how the discussion went. The discussions in the PEN Club which I have attended may not have come close. The discussion went well, and that's it.

The "April" letter has caused a storm of protest. Some participants in the plenum, for example T. Glushkova, demanded that all the activities of the "Aprilists" be firmly censured. However, the chair called for discretion and quiet and recalled that a discussion of "April" was not on the agenda of the plenum. This is why the text of the response which was adopted almost unanimously was laconic and its tone was restrained though sharp words were said in it.

However, there was an overabundance of exaggerations "in the opposite direction." These were statements by A. Buylov in a clearly chauvinistic vein, the support given to him by T. Glushkova, and, putting it bluntly, provocative statements regarding Marxism-Leninism and its role in

our "official ideology" by V. Karpets, as well as his proposal to "honor the memory of all murdered Russian people, beginning with the royal family, by rising." We cannot fail to note at this point that all of these "extreme extremes" were resolutely rebuffed in the speeches by S. Mikhalkov, Yu. Bondarev, F. Kuznetsov, and N. Shundik.

In his closing statement, S. Mikhalkov spoke with concern about the need for the integrity of the Writers Union of Russia and the aspiration of some groups to take it apart. He stressed: "I cannot but say that I am greatly alarmed, and many of those present here are also concerned. The activity of the forces which are driving at the delimitation of creative forces into the so-called 'right' and 'left' is mounting. This is not happening in the Writers Union alone; it is also happening in cinematography, in the theater; it is happening all over the country. These circles promote confrontation and fuel nationalist attitudes which is actually bringing about the disintegration—I will not shrink from using this word—of the Writers Union and other creative arts unions. If we are going to be led by them—and some of us are—we will be stuck in internecine wars, and it will be difficult for us to get out of this quagmire."

(LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, No 47, 22 November 1989)

Fire in Caspian Oil Field Extinguished

NC2012131489 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
0440 GMT 19 Dec 89

[From Republican Press Review]

[Text] The fire in the 28 April Oil Field in the Caspian lasted for 3 weeks. Six oil wells were on fire. The fire has been extinguished and all the wells sealed off with cement. Restoration work continues on deep sea platform No 2.

A VYSHKA correspondent gives newspaper readers detailed information on the incident.

Oil continues to be extracted from the six wells not touched by the fire. Every day, 150 to 300 tons of oil are extracted from each of these wells.

Cross-Examination Begins in Uzbek Bribery Trial

PM2012151889 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
19 Dec 89 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Questioning of Witnesses Begins"]

[Text] The cross-examination of witnesses began on 18 December at the USSR Supreme Court in the trial of I. Uzmankhodzhayev, former first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, who is accused of bribe-taking.

One of the first to give evidence was M. Khudaybergenov, former first secretary of Khorezm Oblast Uzbek Communist Party Committee. He is in custody on a charge of giving and receiving bribes. The investigation into the criminal case against him has already been completed, and the materials have been handed over to the court. Khudaybergenov could be called the chief witness. Of the R55,300 allegedly received by Usmankhodzhayev as bribes, Khudaybergenov gave him R50,300, in the opinion of the preliminary investigation organs.

In the course of the preliminary investigation Khudaybergenov admitted giving bribes. "In handing over the money I assumed that I would thereby gain Usmankhodzhayev's attention and establish a closer relationship with him"—that is how he explained this fact at the investigation.

In court, however, Khudaybergenov did not confirm the evidence he had given earlier. He stated that he had incriminated Usmankhodzhayev for two reasons. First: He was angry with Usmankhodzhayev because "he could have rectified the situation in the republic after Rashidov, but did not." The second reason Khudaybergenov cited was the unlawful attitude of the preliminary investigation organs toward him; he was forced to incriminate Usmankhodzhayev and others under pressure from them.

After the cross-examination of witnesses, the court will embark on the investigation of other evidence in this case.

Legal Official on Trial

LD2711163289 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1845 GMT 25 Nov 89

[Interview with Yanis Eduardovich Dzenitis, USSR Deputy Procurator General, by interviewer Galina Kalashnikova—recorded; date and place not given]

[Text] [Kalishnikova] Yanis Eduardovich, there was a brief report in the press recently that investigations had been completed into cases of corruption by top party and administrative workers in Uzbekistan and that the materials had been handed over to the court. Earlier these reports came as a bombshell to public opinion. At what stage are the cases that have been placed before the court?

[Dzenitis] As our press has already reported, the USSR Procuracy has completed investigations into criminal cases against a large group of officials of the Uzbek SSR, senior officials who have been accused of systematically receiving bribes from their subordinates and other individuals over a number of years. The bribes involved large sums and were for protection, for support in their work and for assistance in resolving economic and other questions. These cases have already been sent to the courts and evidently they will be considered in the courts in the very near future. Specifically, I would like to say that some of these cases have already been examined. For example, one of the cases against Khudayberdyyev, the former chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Uzbek SSR, has already been examined by the Supreme

Court. Khudayberdyyev was found guilty of bribe-taking and was sentenced to 9 years' deprivation of liberty.

[Kalashnikova] What is the total amount of bribes that he received?

[Dzenitis] As far as the total amount of the bribes is concerned specifically in this case I do not have those figures at the moment. But I can say that in those cases that have been sent to the court—in the instances that are the subject of the charges—the total amount of the bribes amounts to around R2 million. Besides this, however, the Supreme Court, on the basis of the data in our possession, has taken on several more cases, that is to say cases which will be dealt with here in the Supreme Court in Moscow. There is the case against Usmankhodzhayev, the former first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan, cases against Aytmuratov and Abdullayeva, former secretaries of the Central Committee in Uzbekistan, and also a case against Kamalov, former first secretary in Kara Kalpakia. These cases will be examined in the USSR Supreme Court in the very near future. The remaining cases will be examined in courts in Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenia, Kazakhstan, and the Russian Federation. One of these cases—that against Musakhanov, former first secretary of the Tashkent Oblast Committee of the party—is already being examined at the present time in Dushanbe by the Supreme Court of Tajikistan. Musakhanov is accused of receiving six bribes involving R46,000.

[Kalashnikova] Please say how you, as a citizen and as a professional, assess these crimes: are they just economic crimes? Or can one describe them differently when they are comitted by individuals occupying such senior state and party posts? How was it possible for this to take place at all on such a scale in these republics?

[Dzenitis] In this respect Uzbekistan is not the only republic where major abuses and theft were committed during the years of stagnation, where bribe-taking, corruption and so on flourished. Such crimes were also committed in many other republics, in Moscow and in the city, too. I am thinking of the bribe-taking and abuse that were encountered in the retail trade industry, the fisheries industry, the light industry, and so on. I think, therefore, that we cannot say that Uzbekistan occupies some special position in this respect. Today, however, taking into consideration our previous information, I would like to dwell in greater detail precisely upon those matters and those issues which are linked with the investigations into the cases in Uzbekistan. In this connection I would like to give some figures. Staff of the law-enforcement bodies of the Uzbek republic and investigators seconded from other parts of the country investigated and sent to court more than 800 cases over a 4-year period. These involved exaggerated accounting, theft, and bribe-taking. More than 5,000 officials were brought to account under the criminal code in these cases. During this work about R100 million of damage inflicted was made good to the state in real terms. Insofar as the exaggerated reporting, the thefts, and the bribe-taking were linked to machinations in the procurement of cotton, it was established by the inquiries and experts' investigations that were carried out that more than 4 million tonnes of cotton was added to the actual figures in the republic in the years 1978-83. More than R2.5 billion of state resources were paid our illegally to cotton-growing farms, a considerable part of which was stolen. That is the source of the bribe-taking and the source of the resources and the major sums of money—amounting to approximately R20 million - which were taken from the plunderers, the bribe-takers, and the individuals abusing their official positions. That, approximately, is the situation. But then it has to be said—and this has already been said before—that Usmanov, the Minister of the Cotton-Cleaning Industry of Uzbekistan, five of his deputies, and senior staff of local party and administrative bodies of the Ministry of Light Industry of the USSR and of a number of departments and organizations subordinate to this ministry have been brought to account under the criminal code. Proceedings were brought against them for accepting from Uzbekistan in return for bribes cotton waste instead of cotton. For this they made unjustified payments of R226 million.

[Kalashnikova] Yanis Eduardovich, the fact is, however, that now people are worried most of all by the issues of guarantees in law. Where is the guarantee that what you have been talking about today will not be repeated?

[Dzenitis] It seems to me that the first guarantee is the fact that democracy, glasnost, and other such elements which are linked with the extension of glasnost and democracy are expanding day by day in our country. That is one thing. Another, I think, is that leading cadres are selected according to different principles at the present time. That, too, is a guarantee. And the third point to which I would like to draw attention, I think, is that the examination of these specific cases will also be a serious warning to everyone - and it already is a warning to everyone occupying a senior position and who has to carry out his official duties with honor.

[Kalashnikova] Tell me, Yanis Eduardovich, what statistics does the USSR Procuracy have regarding so-called economic crimes? Is this trend on the decline or on the upsurge now, or is everything pretty stable?

[Dzenitis] The picture is a somewhat unpleasant one. I would like to express a few notions and data which were the subject of discussion at the USSR Procuracy Collegium. The Collegium established that recently there has been a substantial increase in economic offenses, encompassing a wide range of branches of the national economy. Negative phenomena such the growth of non-labor income, speculation, organized embezzlement, numerous infringements in cooperative activities, and so on are giving rise to particular concern. Over 2 million cases of embezzlement and short accounts have been detected in state and cooperative trade in just 18 months. Losses from failure to safeguard cargos in transit are great. A great deal of work was done in this direction in the Ukrainian SSR. The procurator of that republic reports to us that recently 24 criminal cases have been brought in connection with criminal negligence regarding fulfillment of official duties, giving rise to unproductive standstills of means of transport, and causing substantial damage to the state. This issue was the subject of discussion at the collegium of the Ukrainian Procuracy, too. A high appraisal of the work done in this direction in Ukraine was given to the Procurator General. One could say a great deal about economic crimes, but I think a special program should be devoted to this issue.

[Kalashnikova] And now, Yanis Eduardovich, to a matter which undoubtedly is of concern to all. Tell us, what do you think compelled the group of deputies to return for further investigation the case of Smirnov, former secretary of the Communist Party of Moldavia Central Committee, after it had been dropped by the official organs due to the absence of corpus delicti?

[Dzenitis] I would like to make your question a little more exact: the group of deputies did not return the case for further investigation; the group which was set up studied the case, and came to the conclusion that the investigation of the case had been dropped prematurely. My own personal opinion is as follows: the USSR Procuracy was quite justified in dropping the Smirnov case. It was ascertained that the testimony of these so-called bribers is very unspecific, it contains very substantial contradictions in respect of sums, time, and so forth. And, specifically, it was not evident exactly what specific actions Smirnov committed if he was indeed really given this money. What is a bribe? A bribe is given so that a certain official should carry out some action in the interests of the bribe-givers. Smirnov perpetrated no actions. That is my personal opinion. It is my opinion that no case may be sent to court on the basis of falsified evidence, no case at all, including the case accusing Smirnov.

[Kalashnikova] Television viewers are extremely concerned by the trials currently taking place in the country, and the attitude of the USSR Procurator's Office to them, and specific actions being taken in various aspects.

[Dzenitis] If television gives us the opportunity—thank you—we can, I think, describe the very intersting issues and problems which are at present being solved by the bodies of the Procuracy. We can describe how a new concept of procuratorial supervision is being prepared, what changes are expected in this regard. We can describe procuratorial supervision in the armed forces and how this matter stands at present. And, in industry, the investigators of the USSR Procurator's Office have other tasks which have arisen on the soil of nationalistic manifestations in the Georgian and Azerbaijan SSR, and there are events connected with the earthquake, and so forth. It is impossible to enumerate all these things today, however. If such an opportunity is presented to us, though, we are agreeable to informing television viewers on them, as well as giving regular information as far as is within our powers on what matters will be examined by the judicial organs in our country in the near future.

Komi Obkom Plenum Discusses Nationalities

LD1812040189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2230 GMT 17 Dec 89

[Text] A program for perfecting interethnic relations in Komi Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic was on the agenda of a plenum of the Komi Oblast party committee, held in Syktyvkar. The draft program was published in the local press on the eve of the plenum. Representatives of about 70 nationalities reside in the republic today. This, naturally, brings about a host of problems, of which the main are the autonomous republic's transition to economic independence, and issues of language and culture. We draw your attention to the fact that for the first time the plenum of the oblast party committee was broadcast on television.

New Grodno Obkom Head Appointed

90UN0392A Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in Russian 17 Nov 89 p 1

[Text] Grodno, 15 November (BELTA)—A plenum of the oblast committees of the Belorussian Communist Party, which discussed an organizational matter, was held here today.

The plenum relieved L.G. Kletskov of his duties as first secretary and member of the bureau of the obkom [oblast party committee] in connection with his request to take pensionable retirement. Gratitude was expressed to L.G. Kletskov for his long and fruitful work in the oblast party organization.

As a result of the discussion of the nominations for the office of obkom first secretary, the names of D.K. Artsimeni, chairman of the oblispolkom [oblast soviet executive committee]; I.G. Moshko, second secretary of the obkom; and B.M. Semenov, secretary of the obkom, were listed on the ballot.

After the first round of the secret ballot, in which none of the contenders acquired the necessary number of votes, I.G. Moshko withdrew his candidacy. In the second round, Vladimir Mikhaylovich Semenov was elected obkom first secretary.

The plenum was addressed by Ye.Ye. Sokolov, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee.

V.I. Boris, head of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Organizational-Party and Cadre Work Department, and G.P. Meshcheryakov, senior organizer of the CPSU Central Committee Party Building and Cadre Work Department, participated in the plenum.

Vladimir Mikhaylovich Semenov, first secretary of the Grodno Obkom:

Born in 1936, a Russian, and member of the CPSU since 1963, he was graduated from the Belorussian Polytechnical Institute and the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences and is a mechanical engineer by profession.

He began his career in 1959 as a design engineer at the Minsk Tractor Plant and then worked as deputy secretary of this plant's Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] committee and first secretary of the Minsk Komsomol's Zavodskiy Rayon Committee. Since 1964, he has performed party work: head of the Industrial-Transport Department and second secretary and first secretary of Minsk's Zavodskiy Raykom and first secretary of the Grodno Gorkom [city party committee].

As of January 1974, he has been secretary of the Grodno Obkom.

Comrade V.M. Semenov is a USSR people's deputy. He has been awarded the orders of the October Revolution and Labor Red Banner and two medals.

Officials Sign Priyezhev Obituary

PM2012152089 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Dec 89 Second Edition p 6

[Obituary: "Nikolay Semenovich Priyezhev"]

[Excerpts] Nikolay Semenovich Priyezhev, former first secretary of Ryazan Oblast CPSU Committee and personal pensioner of union status, died on 15 December 1989 at the age of 70. [passage omitted]

[Signed] V.I. Vorotnikov, Ye.K. Ligachev, A.V. Vlasov, A.I. Lukyanov, B.K. Pugo, G.P. Razumovskiy, Yu.A. Manayenkov, Ye.S. Stroyev, G.I. Usmanov, N.Ye. Kruchina, Ye.Z. Razumov, L.I. Khitrun, L.P. Bashmakov, N.N. Grishina, V.V. Kalashnikov, V.P. Popov, V.I. Sidorov.

Correction to Sakharov POLITYKA Interview

PM1912102989

[Editorial Report] This correction pertains to "Sakharov's November Interview in POLITYKA," published on pages 91-94 of the 18 December Soviet Union DAILY REPORT:

Page 91, paragraph one, sentence three should read: "...that this politician—who until recently was counted among Polish "prisoners of conscience"—will be paying a visit to the Kremlin be regarded as the official funeral of..." (Repunctuating, supplying dropped elements).

Scientific

Central Press Beamed to Tashkent by Satellite

LD1712140989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 17 Dec 89

[Text] Material of editions of the central press is relayed from Moscow to the Uzbek capital in only 2.5 minutes. The newspapers arrive along a space communication line via an artificial satellite. Thanks to this, distortions of text and illustrations are virtually ruled out. Twenty central periodicals are delivered along the new channel.

Scientific 'Potential' Threatened by Emigration

PM2012092189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 Dec 89 Second Edition p 6

[S. Brusin report under the rubric "SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 'Roundtable'": "Convertible Docent"]

[Text] "We are obliged to hold on to creative people of Soviet science, who are today being enticed by emissaries from U.S., Israeli, Spanish, Italian, and South Korean firms and many of whom will leave when the law on emigration and immigration is approved"—this appeal by V. Kuchinskiy, chairman of Moscow's "Znaniye" scientific and technical cooperative, was made at the constituent congress, when 120 delegates representing 6,000 scientific and technical cooperatives in the country voted for the creation of their own sectoral trade union as an inalienable part of the country's trade union movement in close cooperation with the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU]. AUCCTU Secretary V.N. Makeyev participated in the work of the congress. Some people may be surprised that the patriotic task of preventing a "brain drain" is being posed not by those responsible for the fate of Soviet science, but by an obscure trade union of cooperative members. However, scientific and technical cooperatives have already come face to face with the problem, and this is the subject of our discussion with their chairmen at the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA "roundtable."

Correspondent: How real is the threat of the "wholesale" emigration of the most creative scientific associates from the USSR? For this year, even before the law has begun operating, 2,653 people have already emigrated on business assignments abroad on invitations from capitalist countries through the USSR Academy of Sciences alone. Let us emphasize: These are the best people!

V. Kuchinskiy: Account must be taken of our unique position in the world community: Scientific schools have been formed in practically all the areas of research that exist today. Such a developed scientific base exists in the United States, Japan, France, the FRG, and two or three other countries. Merely fragmentary research is being conducted in many highly developed states, while the majority of countries have no science at all. If we were to lose this advantage, we could not overcome our laggardness in technical progress. Yet we are teetering on the brink: Our scientists' measly earnings are hardly comparable with the average U.S. engineer's annual income of $45,000, and the availability of instruments in Soviet scientific research institutes is even worse than in developing countries. In short, it is a question, in my opinion, of a problem of national security.

A. Bylinskiy, the "Samanta" cooperative, Gomel Oblast: This contrast exacerbates the matter. In the world, valuable ideas are put straight into production, whereas our specialists have never known this good fortune: The most staunch of them spend 10-20 years trying to get what they have developed introduced, while the rest—who do not have the strength for this—suffer chronic depression.

A. Nikitin, the "Metrologiya" cooperative, Saratov: I believe that all our researchers of an international standard in departments, in scientific research institutes, and in cooperatives have already comprehended all this and tried it out for themselves. In this sense the "brain drain" has already happened for many people, not as a fact but as an intention. However, I am convinced that we have a means of holding on to scientific cadres. This means is the scientific and technical cooperatives themselves. As a form of organizing the labor of scientists, they have appeared at an exceptionally opportune time. Cumbersome, bureaucratic scientific research institutes have become obsolete. A small collective of like-minded creators possessing organizational, financial, and cadre freedom provides the best conditions for scientific questing. The same people who yesterday were suffering all the ills of alienation from labor in scientific research institutes are working selflessly in cooperatives for 12 hours a day, with no days off.

Correspondent: Well, such advantages are probably enjoyed not only by cooperatives but also by independent economically accountable state and leasehold laboratories as the basic component instead of the present scientific research institutes in the planned new model for the functioning of our science. The scientific and technical cooperatives and these laboratories will have many common features.

V. Kuchinskiy: However, the cooperative brings us closer to emigration under contract. A prominent scientist needs as a partner a manager who looks at development results through the eyes of business: More than one generation of our scientists has grown up outside this natural tandem. People have now begun to be liberated in cooperatives for the first time, they are being seized by the excitement of business, and they can see what they would be capable of if they had U.S., Japanese, or West German instrument centers at their disposal.

Correspondent: In your view, is it hopeless to hold on to scientists?

V. Kuchinskiy: Not at all. There are many patriots among scientists—those who do not think along petty, short-term lines but who want to benefit the homeland and the people by their work. Incidentally, this is not necessarily a sacrificial stance. Many people—and I belong to their number—can see that it is precisely the conditions of backwardness and neglect in many aspects of our life that constitute an immense field of work for a scientist. If he can staunchly bear the first adversities, it is right here that the best conditions for professional development exist.

Correspondent: From your words it is just one step to a request to sociologists—to gather together within the scientific public such motives characteristic of serious people: What kind of personal conviction can tip the scales and induce a scientist to stay and work in his own country, while many things would seem to be pushing him into the embraces of a Western firm. A state order for sociology would be of paramount importance!

A. Nikitin: Alas, sociology is powerless for that section of scientists who operate in scientific and technical cooperatives. Here personal motives of conduct are overshadowed by the common problems of cooperatives. You do not have to conduct a poll in 100 cities to learn that cooperatives need a legitimate means of acquiring scientific equipment and premises and a legitimate procedure for deals with state scientific research institutes and enterprises. We do not ask for help. It is enough just that we are not hindered. But we are greatly hindered precisely by the fact that these three questions have not been regularized: If someone's wings have been clipped, he cannot develop either as a scientist or as an entrepreneur. Which positive motives of use to one's country will sociology be able to detect under these conditions?

V. Shulman, legal adviser to the sectoral cooperative union, Tashkent City: I will name what I view as the key condition for the creative person of science in the problem of "to emigrate or not to emigrate." This is stability of legislation. The Law on Cooperatives, let us say, has been adopted—let us follow it to the letter. But in reality? Central economic departments and sectoral ministries issue hundreds of normative acts restricting its operation—I speak with knowledge of the matter, as a jurist. The state, as it were, makes it clear to the cooperative member: You are not needed! He, of course, cannot help making comparisons—here he is not needed, there he is needed. If, on the contrary, the state's principled line of supporting the most healthy, fruitful forces of science in the cooperative sector could be traced in the actions of departments, many people would respond in their heart to this and—I assure you—would put up with disorder, the lack of material supplies, and a considerably lower income than their Western colleagues, if only they were of use in the country's rebirth. So, it is precisely the rule-of-law state that is a factor in getting scientific cadres to stay. For as long as it does not leave the impression that someone is especially pushing scientists in the cooperative sector toward the idea of emigration.

In Uzbekistan, for example, all planning and surveying cooperatives have been willfully closed down, and the breaking of contracts and the partners' losses seem not to count here.

A. Bylinskiy: Such inconsistency gives rise to a counterwave of immoral conduct—"anything goes." A scientist's disloyalty to the homeland can take the form of selling to foreign firms for a song scientific ideas discovered over decades by Soviet schools of researchers but not yet introduced.

Primitive theft of finished developments is also possible, in just the same way as apartments are robbed—for scientific and technical cooperatives do not have premises that are at all suitable, properly locked and guarded. In our own cooperative we have introduced all modern forms to warn of a leak of information, but this is our own private initiative.

And again: Dishonesty with regard to state intellectual property will partly be the consequence of our age-old inability to protect the creator's copyright. This has shaped an immoral atmosphere in many collectives. It was considered normal for five administrators of science to include their names as coauthors of an invention, for subcontracting enterprises to blackmail the author when issuing the act of utility of his development, and for there to be a need for tremendous endurance in order to find one's way through the maze of the patent service. Over the years all this has given rise to a vindictive feeling in many people, and this can find an outlet in secret deals with foreign firms.

Ye. Novikov, chairman of the "Professional" charity fund, Kharkov City: I believe, however, that it is wrong to draw the conclusion that it is necessary to return to the "iron curtain," since today's problems are precisely its handiwork. It is necessary to get accustomed to the logic of an open society—let someone freely go abroad under contract and know that he will be able to return at any moment. This culture of thinking and behavior will eliminate the hullabaloo over the temptations of foreign travel. It is necessary to more boldly create joint firms, send more postgraduates to foreign universities, and spare no expense to invite foreign specialists to our higher educational institutions—in short, bring ourselves more vigorously up to the Western level. Alas, at an international symposium today it is possible to meet 300-400 delegates from the United States, Japan, and France and just one or two of our scientists—and these are of advancing years.... Yes, we will lose part of our scientific cadre potential by opening up free emigration, but we must work all the more energetically to ensure that a worthy young generation takes the place of those who have left—we have big omissions here.

Correspondent: How, specifically, could your trade union help initially?

A. Nikitin: In conditions whereby leaders of scientific establishments remain in a state of complacency, fail to sound the alarm, and undertake no farsighted actions, and when those people responsible for ideological work in scientific collectives have entirely acknowledged their impotence before the trial of "free emigration," I believe that it is the cooperatives which can and must deal a rebuff to the thrifty Western entrepreneur who has already spotted what is bad about Soviet science. We know the secret mechanisms and psychology and are ready to advise Supreme Soviet committees and commissions. On the legislators' orders our trade union would set about studying experience of retaining scientific cadres accumulated in Asian, African, and Latin American countries—as it happens we have something to learn from them.

V. Kuchinskiy: The uncompetitive level of thinking and of organizing matters, to which everyone is accustomed, will do a disservice in the struggle to retain the best cadres. The West's slick operators function as in a vacuum under the conditions of our sluggishness. I am convinced that negotiations have been held today with a section of the most productive Soviet scientists. Many people in our country still reckon that this phenomenon does not exist. But meanwhile the competitive battle "to divide up" our scientific potential has gone deep. By participating in joint projects with Soviet enterprises, Western firms "run their eyes" over promising associates for themselves.

'Timely, Reliable' Radiation Monitoring Urged

904E0035A Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 13 Dec 89 p 2

[Report by L. Piskunov, engineer, physicist in the RSFSR Ministry of Health Department of Radiation Hygiene Oblast Sanitation and Epidemiological Station: "Having Once Lied...."]

[Text] The aftermath of the accident at the Chernobyl AES [nuclear electric power station] has imprinted in the memory a feeling of alarm concerning the radiation future of the environment. Have we learned anything from this tragic lesson? Is radiation safety being insured at AES's when they are operating normally? For the concept "normal operation" also includes "usual" technological mishaps and unplanned reactor shutdowns for various reasons.

The public has a right to count on information about the radiation situation. If society cannot get by without nuclear power engineering, and this is the case today, then instead there should be a realistic guarantee of radiation safety for everything living, not just within the area of any particular AES taken in isolation.

Hence we draw a very important conclusion: There is a need for radiation monitoring. Timely, reliable, and public.

Our one reservation is that standards that formulate the basic principles of radiation safety have been in force for decades: The maximum permissible radiation dose must not be exceeded, radiation must be kept to the lowest possible level, any kind of unjustified irradiation is banned. However, if we talk about the aims and tasks of radiation monitoring in AES zones, then up to now this issue remains unclear. How else can we explain the vague requirements for external monitoring contained in the AES-79 sanitation rules? It is no secret that even now attempts are being made to limit the monitoring of emissions and discharges from the AES's themselves, while their actual distribution and influence on the environment is assessed by calculations based on one of the latest theoretical models.

It is not hard to guess who favors this kind of "hybrid" monitoring. For in the event of a nonstandard situation, it is also possible to refer to the imperfections of the model and thus avoid responsibility for the sins that are committed. On the other hand, in this event, only the departmental dosimetry service has the information on actual emissions and discharges, and this means that we cannot rule out the possibility of standards being exceeded, about which the local population will know nothing. At present this kind of information is not available to territorial organs of the state sanitation inspection service. In our opinion this also includes the idea of departmental support for the "hybrid" method of monitoring. Can we rely totally and completely on this kind of monitoring? No, no! This is why.

None of the specialists is about to deny the complexity of natural processes taking place in the dispersion, and on the contrary, buildup of technologically generated radionuclides in environmental objects. They can be detected only by radiochemical analysis of samples. Accidental or unmonitored emissions and discharges from AES's cannot be ruled out, and during prolonged operation an AES does affect radiation characteristics negatively.

This means that we cannot get by without reliable radiation monitoring that is, moreover, independent of the department, in the zones of AES's. We go further: We need a qualitatively new type of control in the form of radiation monitoring. Its task is to record the radiation situation on the spot, and track and predict it. Hence also the goal of making a quantitative evaluation of the technogenic dose received by the population through all the radiation pathways, and unconditional compliance with the basic principles of radiation safety. This means that on the basis of monitoring, data decisions should be made about improving AES operating technologies, going as far as closing down reactors. Proper monitoring is also needed in order to detect in good time any possible buildup of radionuclides at particular localities and in water reservoirs around AES's and to determine any dangerous pathways by which they could migrate. In other words, to resolve those tasks that the "hybrid" method of control is unable to do.

The question also naturally arises of the kind of restructuring that would enable minimum costs by using the best way to solve the task that has been set. It can be claimed that this kind of method has been devised, and it is called [ORM] optimized radiation monitoring. Since 1976 the ORM method has been approved by organs of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] State Inspection Service in the zones of the Belorussian AES and the Bilibino AES, and despite climatic and other differences, it has, thanks to the use of computers, shown itself to be highly effective and objective in both cases.

Notwithstanding, an unexpected obstacle has been raised in the industrial approval and introduction of ORM because of delays by the departments of nuclear power engineering and the USSR Ministry of Health. Using truths (if we so consider the formal devices and contrivances) and untruths (distortions of the factual results of ORM) the departments are refusing to use the mew method. These are, it is not hard to guess, the departmental All-Union Scientific Research Institute for Nuclear Power Stations [VNIIAES], and in team with it, the USSR Ministry of Health Institute of Biophysics, not by chance known for its "fine words about Chernobyl."

VNIIAES associates L. Khamyanov and A. Kononovich have for two decades now been throwing a wrench into the wheel of elementary approval of ORM in the zone of any AES that they choose. The prejudiced departmental opponents have have set out along the path of falsifying ORM, or at least discrediting it. This is very simply done: They ascribe to the new method data from objects on which it has not been used. This is difficult to check, but it is so. They have probably not yet thought of the best way to discredit ORM. Early in 1986 (before the accident at the Chernobyl AES!) high level leadership in the persons of the VNIIAES deputy director Ye. Larin and Institute of Biophysics deputy director L. Buldakov confirmed the fake conclusion about ORM's unsuitability. Evidently things would be quieter thus.... They did not think that any response was called for to the collective protest of dozens of people using ORM, and experts who were convinced by their own experience of its effectiveness. Not even out of politeness. This means that spurious facts were accepted. Like, the hidden contamination detected by the ORM method. In short, an unattractive story that also smacks of the criminal. There are more than enough facts and documents on this score.

In April of this year a recommendation was adopted at a meeting of the USSR Ministry of Atomic Power apparatus to approve ORM in the zone of the Beloyarsk AES. However, it is not certain that this will happen. Meanwhile, the problems needs to be resolved as quickly as possible because of the primitive nature of existing monitoring. It cannot be otherwise if it is done according to outdated instructions drawn up at the dawn of nuclear power engineering. The instructions take no account of the considerable scientific achievements in radiation hygiene, radiation ecology, and other related disciplines. Insufficient use is being made of up-to-date technical facilities such as automation, computer equipment, and highly sensitive thermoluminscent dosimetry.

In short, we need a major restructuring not only of the departmental monitoring system but also the organs of the state sanitation inspection service. The paradox is that given the diversity of control (the USSR Ministry of Atomic Power, the USSR Ministry of Health and union republic ministries of health state sanitation inspection services, and the USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology) it is sometimes impossible to obtain a unified picture of the radiation situation around an AES. Where is the correct information for the public! For example, this bungle was made on 12 February this year in the newspaper URALSKIY RABOCHIY when according to what was said by the leadership of the Beloyarsk AES there had been no increase in the annual radiation dose received by the local population according to the standard of 900 millirems annually, while in reality this standard is 25 times more strict for an AES. So again we have to doubt the correctness of the information from department representatives. As they say, having once lied, who will believe you?

The chairman of the USSR Gompromatomnadzor [State Committee for Safety in the Atomic Power Industry] V. Malyshev recently expressed the thought that an AES should have no secrets. We can only welcome such an opinion and hope that it will not remain empty words. It cannot be otherwise if we stipulate the need for truthful information. Moreover, self-critical information, so that any omissions and mistakes can be immediately corrected.

Arguments Against Nuclear Power Heard

PM2012152789 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 16 Dec 89 First Edition p 2

[Interview with Candidate of Juridical Sciences B.A. Kurkin, senior lecturer at the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Higher Legal Correspondence Course School, by Olga Plakhotnikova: "Bombarding the Nucleus of Truth. A Non-Professional's Arguments in the Dispute Over Nuclear Power"—date and place of interview not stated; first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] In the notes from the international "roundtable" at the USSR Nuclear Society ("Dispute Without Opponents," 12 October 1989), we were not given the opportunity to hear the arguments of opponents of nuclear power stations. Today Candidate of Juridical Sciences B.A. Kurkin, senior lecturer at the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Higher Legal Correspondence Course School, continues the conversation.

[Plakhotnikova] Boris Aleksandrovich, you, like other opponents of nuclear specialists, often hear accusations of incompetence. They would seem to have some basis: You are a graduate of the Moscow State Institute of International Relations International Law Faculty and have published 40 articles and a book on sociological problems. In short, you have no direct connections with nuclear power. On what grounds can you start judging professionals?

[Kurkin] As practice shows, the lack of a diploma cannot per se testify to an inability to understand a particular problem. We do not have to look far for an example: International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA] Director General H. Blix is a lawyer by profession. On the other hand, although nuclear power station workers are professionals, cases of accidents at nuclear power stations are concealed from them, just as they are from the government and the public. While refusing "nonspecialists" the right to make their own judgment, the specialists themselves, contrary to their own logic, claim to have universal knowledge. I cannot believe that, for example, O. Shumyatskiy, the Nuclear Society's public relations officer, who constantly participates in public debates, is simultaneously an expert in the spheres of economics, ecology, law, sociology, geology, and other sciences. So accusations of incompetence can cut both ways.

Thus Doctor of Physico-Mathematical Sciences O. Kazachkovskiy (for a long time chief editor of the ATOMNAYA ENERGIYA journal and head of an institute) states in the columns of PRAVDA that "nuclear power stations do not release anything into the atmosphere." However, all the textbooks say that nuclear power stations release a significant quantity of radionuclides—such as iodine, cesium, strontium, and xenon.

[Plakhotnikova] However, if you argue like this, you will never get out of the deadlock.

[Kurkin] We expect one thing from the professionals—honest, frank discussion of the nuclear power industry's real problems. But unfortunately, many nuclear power specialists today have been deprived of the right to express their own independent point of view. They risk losing their jobs if they reveal departmental "secrets," as they are bound by signed statements. Thus the Kalinin nuclear power station board and party committee took reprisals against G. Asinkritov, a nuclear power unit mechanical engineer who actively opposed increasing the station's capacity.

You may have noticed that since around the fall of last year, the "loyal" nuclear experts have not merely begun to speak out but have literally gone on the offensive. How can this departmental "outburst of glasnost" be explained? It is all very simple: The specialists were ordered to come out of their nuclear bunkers and strongholds. A decision was adopted to form an "interdepartmental information and public relations council to coordinate propaganda activity in the sphere of nuclear power." The interdepartmental council's executive organ is the Center for Public Information on Nuclear Energy, whose main task is to "elaborate recommendations and methods of carrying out propaganda work."

The greatest paradox is that our own money will be spent on convincing us of the usefulness of nuclear power stations: The center's activity is financed out of the state budget. They are not stinting on hard currency for this purpose, though there isn't even enough for medicines: One deputy minister received orders "to provide within plans for the allocation of central hard currency resources in 1989-1990 for appropriations to purchase the necessary imported equipment and consumables for equipping the center."

So we will soon be able to read brochures about the ecological purity of nuclear energy, printed on Finnish paper which we receive at the same time as radioactive waste from the "Loviisa" nuclear power station in Finland and for which we pay with energy from the Leningrad nuclear power station (whose waste we naturally keep).

Unfortunately, it is still too early to talk about a triumph of glasnost. For example, there is much talk of dismantling nuclear power stations, but very few people know that the problem simply brooks no delay. The lifetime of the power units is 25-30 years. The first and second power units at the Beloyarsk nuclear power station and the first block at Novovoronezh and Rovno nuclear power stations have now been shut down for various reasons, the Armenian nuclear power station has been shut down altogether, but the idea of dismantling is still at the... study stage.

Another problem: Radioactive waste. How are nuclear departments planning to store it, and where are the guarantees that this problem will really be solved one day?

[Plakhotnikova] Boris Aleksandrovich, aren't you exaggerating? After all, back before Chernobyl IAEA Director General H. Blix said that "no technical discoveries are necessary to ensure a safe method for burying waste."

[Kurkin] Highly radioactive waste is not buried anywhere in the world. There is only experience of its temporary storage. The conclusions of the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium commission also bear witness to the difficulty of solving these problems.

The seriousness of the situation in the nuclear power industry is aggravated by the fact that our country is gradually being transformed into a storehouse for waste from CEMA countries and Finland. Furthermore, we are constructing a nuclear power station in Cuba and are going to construct one in India, and consequently we will accept their waste. It is appropriate to mention here that even now our country receives over 300 tonnes of spent fuel from abroad each year.

Admittedly, senior officials of the nuclear departments, in particular B. Semenov, former deputy chairman of the State Committee for the Utilization of Atomic Energy, and Ye. Velikhov, director of the Kurchatov Atomic Energy Institute and vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, try to convince our public of the benefits of these "deals." Admittedly, it is not clear what this gross disinformation is predicated on: Our people's complete illiteracy or their complete silence? Judge for yourselves the benefits of storing death forever in our land: B. Semenov promises that we will receive $1 billion over 30 years (enough for a 1-gigawatt power unit). But this is payment for losing your health, and maybe even your life! Is it even such a large payment? We received $176 billion for our petroleum sales between 1974 and 1984....

Our professors often put forward an argument that they think is irrefutable: They say that in the past year alone 345,000 people have been injured in traffic accidents, but just 31 people died in the Chernobyl accident and 145 contracted radiation sickness. Incidentally, this is disinformation again: Over 60 people have died since 1987 merely among those who worked at the Chernobyl nuclear power station, which is something the public does not know.... The logic is: Why should we fight for safety at nuclear power stations when many more people die in the transport system? Putting the question like this is absurd. I would note that an analysis prepared on orders from the U.S. Government and published in NEWSDAY said that there is a 50-percent chance that another incident like the Three Mile Island accident will occur in the United States by the year 2000.

[Plakhotnikova] However, in our country, according to officials, the safety of nuclear power stations is increasing. For example, at M. Gorbachev's meeting with the workers of the Chernobyl nuclear power station, portions of which were shown on Central Television 23 February, Academician Ye. Velikhov said that safety has increased by approximately three orders of magnitude, that is, around 1,000-fold.

[Kurkin] In order to make such a bold and responsible statement you would need to build a large number of identical nuclear power stations, pick personnel to work there similar in terms of all parameters (professional, psychophysiological, and so on), operate the stations for quite a long time, and study the accident statistics during that period. Only if the number of accidents in new or modernized nuclear power stations really did decrease by a factor of 1,000 times would specialists be able to say that safety at the nuclear power stations had increased 1,000-fold.

There isn't a single reliable reactor in the country at the moment. The VVER-1000 reactor [water-cooled, water-moderated reactor] which has been introduced to replace the RBMK-1000 [high power pressure-tube reactor], which showed its mettle in Chernobyl, is itself already obsolete—the steam generator is designed in such a way that its lifetime is only 2-3 years. At least 15 steam generators have been decommissioned and been replaced in such reactors. The cost of each is R23 million. The direct losses from this already total R350 million, not counting the indirect losses. This will continue.

Today we hear authoritative assurances again and again that "we cannot manage without nuclear power stations." But what are the plans for the development of the power industry complex? Just a few years ago, it was proposed that the capacity of our nuclear power stations reach 196 gigawatts by the year 2000. Today they are talking about increasing it to 55-80 gigawatts by 2005. At the same time, they are stressing that 55 is a much likelier figure than 80. All this testifies that such programs are conjured up out of thin air. To ask how much energy we need is to act like the hero of a Chaplin movie who asks: "Could you tell where to get off—I've forgotten the name of my street."

If we reveal the real picture of our energy needs and preclude losses and unnecessary expenditure, then the answer to the question of whether we need nuclear power or not will certainly be different from what it is today.